

JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ANNUAL REPORT OF PROGRESS

1999-00 SCHOOL YEAR

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr.
State District Superintendent

October 17, 2000 Revision

JERSEY CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mrs. Suzanne Mack, Chairperson
Mr. Franklin L. Williams, Vice Chairperson
Reverend Edward Allen
Ms. Sonia Araujo
Mr. Anthony Cucci
Mr. William DeRosa
Mrs. Willie Flood
Ms. Rosalinda Mayo
Mr. John Nagel

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr., State District Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Deborah S. Alexander, State Assistant Superintendent
Ms. Joann Gilman, Business Administrator
Mrs. Catherine V. Coyle, Associate Superintendent—Instruction
Mr. Francis X. Dooley, Associate Superintendent—Division B
Dr. Adele Macula, Acting Associate Superintendent—Curriculum
Mr. John Pacifico, Associate Superintendent—Division A
Mrs. Priscilla Petrosky, Associate Superintendent—Special Education
Dr. Joanne Kenny, Executive Assistant
Ms. Ellen Zadroga, Executive Assistant
Ms. Linda Colon, Special Assistant—Community & Support Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION.....	6
SECTION I: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	7
A. BENCHMARK TABLE	8
B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES	9
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS.....	9
Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary Schools.....	9
Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools	13
High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards	20
Implementation of Whole School Reform	23
Educational Technology Support Initiatives	25
Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees.....	27
Extended Day/Super Saturdays.....	28
Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages.....	44
Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program.....	46

	<u>Page</u>
Alternative Education.....	47
HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development	52
Corrective Action Plans	57
Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students.....	59
Staff Development Linked to Supervision	61
Administrative Staff Development.....	62
Support by Administrative Staff	64
ACCOUNTABILITY	65
School Performance Targets	65
Comprehensive School Assessment	67
Staff Accountability	69
SECTION II: COMPLIANCE.....	70
ATTAINMENT OF CORRECTION ACTION PLANS.....	71
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—ATTENDANCE RATE.....	75
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—DROPOUT RATE	78
	<u>Page</u>

SECTION III: WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM PROGRESS REPORT	80
WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION STATUS	81
DISTRICT-WIDE WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS & ISSUES	84
ANNUAL REPORT ON THE DISTRICT-WIDE ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN	85
APPENDIX A: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.....	89
High School Proficiency Test.....	89
Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA)	94
Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA).....	97
APPENDIX B: DISTRICT ANALYSIS—COHORTS I and II— <i>fifteen together</i>	100

INTRODUCTION

At year's end, when aggregate data were analyzed, HSPT scores indicated that students were performing at an all time high in Math and again met the State Standard in Writing. The district realizes that Reading must be a priority, as the scores have not improved significantly over the last five (5) years. District personnel have implemented measures as outlined in this report to address the weaknesses noted. Our results are as follows:

- In Reading, the district passing rate **increased** by 3.9 percentage points, yet it fell 4.1 percentage points below the benchmark of 77.1%. The 1999-00 actual found that 73.0% of the students passed in this area.
- In Mathematics, the district passing rate **increased** by 2.4 percentage points, but came 0.8 percentage point shy of meeting the benchmark of 81.9%. The 1999-00 actual found that 81.1% of the students passed in this area.
- In Writing, the district passing rate **decreased** by 0.6 percentage point, but met the State Standard of 85% passing and came only 0.6 percentage point shy of meeting the benchmark of 85.6%. The 1999-00 actual found that 85.0% of the students had passed in this area.
- The year-end student average daily attendance rate was 93.2%--probably the highest it has been since State takeover. The 1996 *Annual Report of Progress of the District Strategic Plan (1995-96)*, records 3-year average attendance rate at each of the four comprehensive high schools between 73.6 and 84.3 percent. Only recently, when uniform district policies to improve student attendance were designed and expectations were conveyed to all school staffs, did we begin to see growth. This school year, all of our comprehensive high schools have exceeded last year's attendance rate by over 7 percentage points! The district was 0.1 percentage point shy of meeting the yearly benchmark of 93.3%, although the three-year State Standard of 90% was attained (with an average of 91.4%).

This report chronicles the strides made at the 4th, 8th and 11th grades. Although we have not met all of our goals, Jersey City's elementary students are making steady progress in their core subjects. Strategies that have been implemented in the last few years are beginning to yield results. Where weaknesses have been found to exist, personnel are continually analyzing data and identifying and addressing needs. School and district personnel are working collaboratively to devise action plans and procure professional development opportunities to assist teachers in meeting student needs. The success of all district initiatives, as outlined in the 1999-00 Education (Strategic) Plan, is judged on each strategy's contribution towards meeting the established benchmarks for student achievement.

**SECTION I:
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

A. BENCHMARK TABLE								
Indicator		Actual 1995-96	Actual 1996-97	Actual 1997-98	Actual 1998-99	Benchmark 1999-00	Actual 1999-00	Difference from Benchmark
E LEMENTARY S CHOOL P ROFICIENCY A SSessment ¹	Language Arts				25.4	45.4	34.4	-11.0
	Mathematics				41.5	56.5	45.0	-11.5
	Science				65.8	75.4	68.7	-6.7
G RADE E IGHT P ROFICIENCY A SSessment ²	Language Arts				76.0	80.5	74.5	-6.0
	Mathematics				48.0	63.0	48.4	-14.6
	Science					N/A	48.2 (Baseline)	N/A
H IGH S CHOOL P ROFICIENCY T EST ³	Reading	67.2	65.3	74.9	69.1	77.1	73.0	-4.1
	Mathematics	71.4	73.5	69.8	78.7	81.9	81.1	-0.8
	Writing	79.2	75.7	78.5	85.6	85.6	85.0	-0.6
S TUDENT B EHAVIOR (%)	Year-End Attendance Rate	89.4	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.3	93.2	-0.1
	3-Year Average Attendance Rate	88.9	89.9	90.7	90.7	91.4	91.4	0.0
	Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	13.27	14.6*	10.0	9.3	10.0	9.92	0.08
¹ Figures as reported on District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 9/14/99 and 9/26/00) ² 1998-99 figures as reported on District Summary Statistics (Report Printed 8/19/99); 1999-00 figures as reported in the NJDOE's "GEPA SCORE REPORTS" published on 8/14/00 ³ Figures as reported by district-compiled aggregate calculations *Figure reported at the end of the 1996-97 school year. After the report was submitted, minor changes were made and the new dropout rate became 14.93%.								

= Met State Standard

B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS:

Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary Schools (page 11)

The following initiatives were implemented to raise performance levels at the City's elementary schools:

- Implement two Whole School Reform Models (COMER at P.S. Nos. 14, 39 and 41 and Co-NECT at P.S. Nos. 17, 27 and 30). (See *Implementation of Whole School Reform*, page 23.)
- In remaining schools, explore all research-based models. (See *Implementation of Whole School Reform*, page 23.)
- Assist Cohort III schools during their Whole School Reform exploration plans. (See *Implementation of Whole School Reform*, page 23.)
- Ensure that the district curriculum is aligned to NJCCCS. (See *Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees*, page 27 and *High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards*, page 20.)
- Expect careful test analysis on the school level and articulation with supervisors regarding specific staff development needs. (See *Staff Development Linked to Supervision*, page 61.)
- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis. (See *Extended Day/Super Saturdays*, page 28.)
- Provide the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors will be responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors. To ascertain the effectiveness of training offered to special education teachers, students

whose teachers attend these classes will be tagged and tracked regarding ability to sit for State assessments and ultimately for performance demonstrated on the ESPA and GEPA. (See *Staff Development Linked to Supervision*, page 61.)

- Expand the Reading Recovery Program. (See *Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program*, page 46.)
- Continue technology efforts of the district. (See *Educational Technology Support Initiatives*, page 25.)
- Involve guidance counselors in the development of programs and referral of students and their families to community social agencies.
- Keep parents informed of students' progress and schedule appointments with the guidance counselor to sign contracts of cooperation when their children do not meet the standard for passing State assessments or were found to be "at risk" after taking diagnostic examinations. (See *Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students*, page 59.)
- Encourage teacher collaboration via Professional Development Schools.
- Focus on mathematics by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance. (See *HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development*, page 52.)
 - Implement the Core Curriculum Content Standards, which, along with their cumulative progress indicators, define expectations for student learning.
 - Use the New Jersey Mathematics Curriculum Framework as a resource to provide practical guidance to implement the Mathematics Standards.
 - Develop students' ability to solve problems, communicate about mathematics, make connections within mathematics and between mathematics and other subjects and reason mathematically.
 - Familiarize students with the format of the ESPA and GEPA. Include multiple choice, short-constructed responses and open-ended questions on assessments that are administered under testing conditions. Teachers and students must be thoroughly familiar with the scoring rubrics for open-ended questions. Both teachers and students must use the scoring rubric (0-3) when assessing open-ended responses.
 - Incorporate test-taking skills and note-taking strategies where appropriate.

- Develop students' thinking ability by asking questions that check knowledge and understanding, requesting an explanation of the thought process used (requiring analysis, prediction, evaluation and generalization) when solving problems.
 - Reflect cooperative practices in mathematics lessons so that students are given opportunities to explore and develop concepts.
 - Teach students how and when to use calculators as tools to facilitate the problems solving process.
 - Develop independent thinkers by providing students with opportunities to solve problems without being prompted by the teacher.
 - Emphasize understanding (not rote learning), applications (not abstractions), problem solving (not drill) and thinking (not recall).
- Focus on language arts by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance.
 - Review format of the tests with teachers.
 - Share activities in language arts frameworks.
 - Present district strategies in reading/writing.
 - Conduct grade level meetings that connect literacy with assessment.
 - Review practice samples, disseminate information and give suggestions for improvement.
 - Engage teachers in speculating and writing about picture prompts and analyzing poem prompts.
 - Share State Department of Education training tapes.
 - Extract and disseminate speaking prompts.
 - Participate in scoring students' performance of the speaking portion of the test.
 - Continue to develop midterm and final exams to mirror the ESPA/GEPA format.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the GEPA indicates that, of the 25 schools (with 8th

grade classes), 12 have improved performance from last year, and 8 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the GEPA indicates that, overall, 12 schools have improved performance from last year and 3 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in math, we believe these figures show progress due to analysis of student performance, staff development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student achievement.

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the ESPA indicates that, of the 27 schools (with 4th grade classes), 19 have improved performance from last year, and 5 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the ESPA indicates that, overall, 14 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. And, on the Science section of the ESPA, 13 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in all three subject areas, we believe that, as the entire school community participates in the Whole School Reform process, all stakeholders will become familiar with test specifications and the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. Coupled with the district's emphasis on staff development and effective, uniform initiatives, our children will ultimately reach their full potential.

Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools (page 13)

The following initiatives were implemented to raise performance levels at the City's high schools:

- Assisted schools during their Whole School Reform exploration plans to identify the model that best “fits” each high school's particular situation. (See *Implementation of Whole School Reform*, page 23.)
 - Teachers implemented the district curriculum for ninth graders, which was aligned to NJCCCS and the HSPA. (See *Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees*, page 27.)
 - Extended school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis. (See *Extended Day/Super Saturdays*, page 28.)
 - Monitored Extended Day classes and student attendance closely by assigning a staff member to work with head teachers and visit school sites to determine quality of the programs and numbers of students being served.
 - Encouraged the best teachers to work in the Super Saturdays and Extended Day programs.
 - Replicated strategies utilized in the writing lab at Ferris High School where students revised and edited their own writing across all subject areas and ensured that students requiring academic support were assigned to these labs in an effort to improve their writing skills through meaningful activities.
 - Planned and opened an alternative high school to service fifty (50) 9th graders and expand over a 4-year period by admitting fifty (50) 9th graders per year. (See *Alternative Education*, page 47.)
 - Provided staff development beginning in the summer of 1999 and extending throughout the school year in reading, writing and math, with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas. Summer staff development opportunities included, but were not limited to: (See *HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development*, page 52.)
- *Integrating the “R” Word into the High School Curriculum* (for English, social studies and science teachers);

- *PHL* (Prentice Hall Literature) and *HSPA: Perfect Together*;
 - *Two Heads are Better Than One: Three, Four and Five Heads are Best!* (for high school teachers of all disciplines);
 - *Instructional Strategies for Teaching Algebra I and II in the Block*;
 - *Instructional Strategies for Teaching Geometry in the Block*;
 - *HSPT Strategies and Hands-On Activities*; and,
 - *Making the (Math) Connection with the Use of Technology* (presented by professors of math, computer science and engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology).
- Exposed math teachers to the most recent approved techniques of effective math teaching through participation in classes provided by Eisenhower grant funding.
 - Provided the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors were responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors. To ascertain the effectiveness of training offered to special education teachers, students whose teachers attend these classes will be tagged and tracked regarding ability to sit for State assessments and ultimately for performance demonstrated on the HSPT. (See *HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development*, page 52.)
 - Provided staff development to familiarize all staff members with test specifications, rubrics, test preparation materials and effective instructional strategies. (See *HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development*, page 52.)
 - Continued assignment of supervisors, who have the expertise and responsibility for the evaluation of staff, to department chairperson positions in the high schools. These supervisors replaced former chairpersons (usually the best teachers) who have been returned to classrooms, thereby placing greater emphasis on the quality of instruction. In addition to their responsibilities for observing instruction and evaluating staff, the department chairpersons also organized and presented staff development workshops at the school site, as well as at conferences. They developed and distributed a monthly newsletter for all staff in their departments. This newsletter directs attention to current developments in the field, instructional strategies and techniques, gives notice of current staff development opportunities and shares the accomplishments of students and staff. (See *Support by Administrative Staff*, page 64.)
 - Continued assignment of department coordinators in the high schools. These individuals maintained a full teaching

load and conducted coordinator job responsibilities before and after school or on their free time. Their responsibilities included assisting and providing materials to staff. (See *Support by Administrative Staff*, page 64.)

- Ensured and assessed implementation of strategies and materials by assigning high school supervisors to classrooms at least two times a week. (See *Support by Administrative Staff*, page 64.)
- Supplied teachers with reports of test analyses outlining deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills. (See *Support by Administrative Staff*, page 64.)
- Continued intensive "18 Day Plan" (prior to each administration) in each high school in all disciplines addressing HSPT proficiencies and test taking techniques.
- Monitored HSPT/HSPA implementation on a daily basis and submitted weekly reports to the Associate Superintendent of Instruction. Vice principals were responsible for their assigned content areas.
- Provided all 9th grade students with a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments and began formal teaching of reading in the high schools. (See *HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development*, page 52.)
- Secured signed contracts of agreement (in October 1999) from parents/guardians and 11th grade at-risk students pledging the student's participation in HSPT academic support programs.
- Scheduled 9th grade students in "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness based on the spring GEPA, previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection. Incoming 9th graders who did not take the GEPA in the spring were placed in appropriate academic support classes based on teacher judgment, grades from their elementary schools and previous standardized tests.
- Post tested all 9th graders in June on an HSPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) to diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses linked to Extended Day, HSPA Prep, Super Saturdays, or HSPA Summer Institute Program and to assist teachers in planning for developmental classes.
- Scheduled 10th graders based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment, self-selection and end of Grade

9 HSPA practice test to attend the “Extended Day” program to focus on areas of weakness.

- Implemented measures to infuse reading across the curriculum based on analysis of test scores that have not indicated significant improvement in reading scores on the HSPT. Language arts literacy electives (with emphasis on reading) were scheduled for all at-risk tenth and eleventh graders.
- Teachers received training on how to help students read effectively and improve comprehension of content area subjects.
- Mandated all at-risk 11th graders to attend HSPT Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturdays or HSPA Summer Institute based on the October and April HSPT 11. Failure to attend will result in the student’s assignment to the SRA process during the fall 1999 semester for an extended day (after school) period with no credit. In September, administer a mathematics diagnostic test to all tenth graders if available.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Many initiatives were planned on the high school level and many were successful. During 1999-00, high schools explored reform models, inventoried existing programs, made decisions whether or not these programs were efficient and determined how they could be improved. All district efforts focused on extending supervisory support to the schools and designing professional development to continue to raise staff awareness and inservice new teachers on effective strategies to improve student achievement. In addition to staff training, many academic support programs were offered to students both during and after regular school hours.

Some initiatives that were planned, however, were modified or a decision was made not to implement them at all. For example, although vice principals monitored HSPT implementation, weekly reports were not submitted to the Associate

Superintendent of Instruction, and Comprehensive School Assessment was not conducted. The reasoning here was that the Comprehensive School Assessment was found to have served its purpose in its first year as an audit of the overall effectiveness of each school's program. The resulting report was shared with the principals and staff who, with the assistance of district personnel, were expected to implement district-required programs/strategies and school plans to address specific needs. Individual school performance was reported in a letter to administrators from the State District Superintendent after test results were received and *Final Evaluation Reports on 1999-00 School-Level Plans* required administrators to work with School Management Teams and subcommittees to reflect on measures that resulted in progress or revamp unsuccessful school efforts.

Overall, many strategies were implemented and are being continued. It is difficult to pinpoint one or a few specific strategies as responsible for student performance. We believe the combination continues to propel the district to greater achievement.

Of the many initiatives listed under *Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools* in our 1999-00 *Education Plan*, the following were not implemented:

- Develop plans to ensure students' participation and attendance in Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes which have not produced desired results due to poor attendance.
- During Super Saturdays and Extended Day Programs, schedule separate sessions for reading and writing HSPT Prep classes to allot maximum time to each subject. Design schedules to ensure participation in classes that address the weakest subject area and sequence the classes so that the maximum number of students will remain (during Saturday HSPT classes) for all sessions in which they need academic support.
- Encourage lower performing students to attend HSPT Prep classes during Super Saturdays Programs by implementing a Super Saturdays HSPT section at a neighborhood high school or elementary school (close to Lincoln and Snyder High Schools) so students from those schools will be more likely to attend.
- Ensure Comprehensive School Assessment of all high schools and monitor the use of technology throughout the curriculum.
- In September, administer a mathematics diagnostic test to all tenth graders if available.

- Employ a language arts supervisor, with a background in reading, to work with students and staff in the high schools.

Successful ☐

Unsuccessful ☐

Not Implemented as Planned ☒

Explanation of Success:

Since Super Saturdays was intended to be for fun, enrichment, and high school students attended HSPT Prep during Extended Day and Summer Institute classes, Super Saturdays was not mandated as an avenue for academic support. However, classes were offered for those students who wished to voluntarily take advantage and for those who could not attend during the Extended Day Program.

In the absence of Comprehensive School Assessment (CSA) visits, district supervisors and school administrators were responsible for monitoring integrated use of technology throughout the curriculum by the instructional staff.

The decision was made not to administer the math diagnostic test to 10th graders. Previous analysis of students' test results indicated that geometry was the weakest area for our students, so a course called *Integrated Geometry 10* was created. This initiative ensured a more expeditious avenue for addressing students' needs. The feeling was that we should address weak areas (as indicated by our analysis) rather than subject our students to another test. Students who qualify for *Integrated Geometry 10* are those who:

- Are eligible to take HSPA only. (No 9R student should be placed in *Integrated Geometry 10*.)
- Took Pre-algebra in the fall 1999.
- Took Algebra 1 for the first time during the 1999-00 school year and scored C or below on the midterm and/or final exam.

- Had their teacher's recommendation.

High School Task Force—New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards *(page 18)*

The task force proposed the following recommendations for implementation during the 1999-2000 school year.

- A ten-credit English class incorporating public speaking for all 9th graders occurring in 80-minute blocks the entire year with the same teacher
- High school elective courses to be analyzed to determine those which promote the Core Curriculum Content Standards and higher order thinking skills
- Expanded required and elective course offerings for credit, as well as non-credit academic support classes offered during summer school, on Super Saturdays, during the evening and via ITV. The “Extended Day” program to become an extension of the school day, with required and elective course offerings for all students, not just those in need of academic support.
- English and math orientation classes and other “remedial” electives to be eliminated and test proficiencies to be addressed in the core curriculum classes.
- District weighting policy for summer school, magnet, honors, AP, college-level, special education, bilingual and home instruction courses to be established.
- Summer School, Super Saturdays, evening and ITV, as well as non-credit academic support classes to be offered to allow all students the opportunity to pursue coursework for a variety of reasons which may include personal satisfaction, preparation for advanced coursework, and make-up for a failed class; course offerings to span the needs of incoming 9th graders through fifth year students; a summer program modeled after those offered by colleges where students can select from the offerings during a given session; partnerships with colleges to be established to provide students the opportunity to take classes off-site for credit.
- A six-week, four-hour day, summer school program to be provided for those students who did not pass any section of the HSPT. Any 12th grader who has not passed one or more sections of the HSPT and who does not attend a summer school program to be required to take an SRA course after school for no credit.

- A policy/procedure for students who enroll after the first two weeks of a semester. Students encouraged to attend class/school and gain credits, rather than audit classes for no credit. Options for students who enroll later in the semester to be developed to allow students to make up missed work, take previously administered examinations, complete additional assignments, etc. Grades to be pro-rated based upon the time enrolled in class. This method would reward mastery of subject matter rather than seat time.
- Appropriate college-level courses and ongoing partnerships centered on providing varied learning experiences outside the high school setting to be investigated.
- A high school orientation program for all incoming 9th graders before school begins in September so that students and their parents could:
 - meet key school staff members;
 - be informed of expectations, class requirements, extracurricular options, etc.; and,
 - make necessary scheduling revisions prior to the first day of school, etc.
- Expanded utilization of ITV resources.
- Conflict Resolution/Peer Mediation strategies and techniques within the health curriculum (taught by trained physical education/health teachers).

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

This initiative allowed the district to inventory/assess existing programs and offerings and to design strategies that would ensure meeting the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. The Task Force brought together senior staff, high school administrators, district supervisors, professors from local colleges and parents to discuss how our high school offerings could be improved to address the Standards. All strategies have been implemented with the exception of revising the district weighting policy for attendance at classes/programs outside of the regular schedule. A committee is presently addressing this. An analysis of student performance on the HSPT indicates that, overall, student test scores continue to improve.

Implementation of Whole School Reform (page 21)

The following steps will be taken to adhere to the Abbott regulations and address the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards through Whole School Reform Implementation:

- Provide training for SMTs after elections of new members.
- Hold meetings with SRI personnel assigned to the district to ensure ongoing communication.
- Identify Cohort III schools for September, 2000.
- Act as a “broker” between schools and program developers.
- Publish a district-wide Accountability Plan, including a system of rewards and sanctions.
- Shift additional responsibility to the school level via the District Decentralization Plan.
- Assist schools with staff development plans.
- Assist Cohort II schools with the development of their school-level budgets.
- Assign Cohort II personnel based on Whole School Reform restructuring.
- Establish networking system by WSR models for Cohort II and between Cohort II and Cohort III.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All steps as outlined above have been taken and schools are becoming more accountable for student performance. This strategy has been successful, as all elementary schools have met State deadlines for adoption of Whole School Reform models—five (5) as part of Mid-Year Second Cohort and twenty-one (21) as part of Cohort III. Six (6) schools in Cohort II actually began implementation of their Whole School Reform models during the 1999-00 school year. Additional achievement targets were designed by SMTs of Cohort II schools which focused on improvement of students’ reading scores, overall academic performance, attendance, a decrease in the number of dropouts, increased parental

involvement, and results of checklists or surveys peculiar to the model. Three of the district's lowest performing schools that were part of Cohort II (P.S. Nos. 14, 39 and 41) received skill development and test preparation assistance from Senior Staff and district supervisors. It is too soon to judge the effects of the models on test performance, as developers state that it takes between 3-5 years to fully implement their models. Student performance for the Cohort II schools, after one year of implementation, follows:

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)											
COHORT II SCHOOLS	LANGUAGE ARTS					MATHEMATICS					SCIENCE
	'98-99	'99-00	Diff.	'99-00 Target	Diff. From Target	'98-99	'99-00	Diff.	'99-00 Target	Diff. From Target	1999-00
#14	61.4	56.0	-5.4	73.2	-17.2	30.2	29.2	-1.0	50.2	-21.0	43.8
#17	79.0	78.6	-0.4	82.0	-3.4	50.6	55.4	+4.8	65.6	-10.2	43.4
#27	98.8	92.4	-6.4	98.8	-6.4	74.0	82.3	+8.3	79.5	+2.8	74.7
#30	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#39	56.1	74.2	+18.1	70.6	+3.6	29.3	43.8	+14.5	49.3	-5.5	34.4
#41	36.9	46.1	+9.2	56.9	-10.8	5.9	6.6	+0.7	48.0	-41.4	19.7

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)															
COHORT II SCHOOLS	LANGUAGE ARTS					MATHEMATICS					SCIENCE				
	'98-99	'99-00	Diff.	'99-00 Target	Diff. From Target	'98-99	'99-00	Diff.	'99-00 Target	Diff. From Target	'98-99	'99-00	Diff.	'99-00 Target	Diff. From Target
#14	9.2	22.2	+13.0	29.2	-7.0	20.6	37.5	+16.9	41.5	-4.0	42.6	54.0	+11.4	57.6	-3.6
#17	13.1	32.5	+19.4	33.1	-0.6	28.7	26.1	-2.6	48.7	-22.6	62.6	60.4	-2.2	73.8	-13.4
#27	25.4	41.5	+16.1	45.4	-3.9	45.0	47.5	+2.5	60.0	-12.5	72.4	68.7	-3.7	78.7	-10.0
#30	14.5	18.2	+3.7	34.5	-16.3	48.0	34.4	-13.6	63.0	-28.6	68.4	65.9	-2.5	76.7	-10.8
#39	12.1	6.7	-5.4	32.1	-25.4	11.7	20.3	+8.6	41.5	-21.2	47.5	38.3	-9.2	62.5	-24.2
#41	21.9	19.1	-2.8	41.9	-22.8	38.1	27.8	-10.3	58.1	-30.3	52.4	45.5	-6.9	67.4	-21.9

Educational Technology Support Initiatives (page 23)

- Revise the district Technology Plan based on Whole School Reform models and NJ Core Curriculum Cross-Content/Workplace Readiness Standards.
- Infuse instructional technology throughout the curriculum. Currently, all schools are networked. Each high school has a minimum of fifty (50) networked classrooms.
- Continue training through the Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC) to ensure that every professional employee has received training. Every teacher has been trained in the basics; however, continuing education in advanced skills will be on a volunteer basis.
- Continue district committee meetings to develop instructional technology competencies and a resource guide of appropriate software by grade level across the curriculum.
- Establish a committee to explore the expanded use of ITV which will allow courses from other high schools, colleges, Liberty Science Center, etc.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All schools submitted individual building technology plans to the Department of Education. Co-NECT schools showcased projects linked to the Core Curriculum Content Standards at their Project Fairs in the spring. During the 1999-00 school year, approximately eight hundred twenty (820) teachers, forty (40) building administrators and sixty (60) central office personnel were given daytime inservice computer training. Approximately six hundred (600) teachers received training by the ETTC in after-school training sessions, and all schools received technology student performance standards (K-8) in September.

District personnel met to formulate a plan for expanded use of ITV. The resulting plan was shared with curriculum supervisors and the Associate Superintendent of Instruction who developed an ITV policy for the district. When the policy

was completed, it was disseminated to principals, supervisors and ITV teachers. The policy outlined how to select courses, maximum number of courses that students could take and maintenance of ITV equipment, among others.

In addition to the already networked classrooms in the high schools, Dickinson High School (the largest of the secondary schools) was completely wired and had approximately twenty (20) additional classrooms outfitted with two (2) computers.

Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees (page 25)

Revision of 5-Year Curriculum Cycle

Elementary and high school curriculum committees by content area and K-8 and 9-12 grade-level representation convene to continue to review and revise district curriculum to NJCCCS and Cross-Content/Workplace Readiness Standards and State test specifications. Curriculum committees are now reviewing social studies and visual and performing arts since these will be the next areas to be assessed. Utilize new State Frameworks in the content areas through professional development and district curriculum implementation practices.

Conduct awareness sessions with principals at Administrators' Academy; review of curriculum alignment by supervisory staff at school-level/grade-level meetings; conduct awareness sessions with parents; and, organize school work sessions at grade level and content area meetings to discuss curriculum scope and sequence, alignment to standards, new test specifications, Core Curriculum Content Standards and Frameworks.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All required courses have been aligned to the NJCCCS. Currently, electives are being revised by curriculum committees. Curriculum implementation is measured by student success on State assessments. School-by-school results can be found in Appendix A beginning on page 89.

Extended Day/Super Saturdays (page 26)

Based on the October and April HSPT 11, at-risk 11th grade students were required to attend Extended Day or Super Saturdays HSPT Prep or HSPT Summer Institute where they received practice in completing test items which mirrored the State assessment and learned test-taking strategies (e.g., using time wisely, answering the various types of questions, narrowing down choices, etc.).

Extended Day

- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Passing rates of those high school students who attended Extended Day classes, as outlined on the following charts, indicate that the classes offered, while they may upgrade the skills of its attendees, are not producing the results for which we had hoped. However, an additional 82 students who attended passed the Reading section (29.1%), 68 passed Math (36.4%) and 64 passed Writing (32.3%). Although this program may not be considered overwhelmingly successful, it helped some of the lower performing students meet with success.

Upon analysis of the test data, it became apparent that:

1. Some students who had not attended 90 percent of Extended Day classes passed section(s) of the HSPT.

2. Many students did not participate in 90 percent of classes.

The following charts compare the percentage of students passing the HSPT who attended at least 90 percent of Extended Day classes (to receive credit for attendance) and those who did not attend Extended Day classes. With the exception of student results in Reading and Writing at Dickinson and Ferris High Schools, all other students who attended Extended Day classes performed better than those who did not. It must be emphasized that Extended Day classes were prescribed for students in greatest need of academic support. The Extended Day classes will continue in 2000-01 as another means of academic support for students who want to improve their performance.

Of the students who attended the Extended Day GEPA Program conducted by all elementary schools, over eight hundred (800) students attended at least 90 percent of the time. Even though attendance requirements were more stringent than at the Super Saturdays Program, students attended their home schools for an “extended day” to receive the academic support that they need.

	R E A D I N G					
	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	98	25	25.5	111	54	48.6
Ferris High School	76	17	22.4	110	25	22.7
Lincoln High School	67	31	46.3	126	32	25.4
Snyder High School	41	9	22.0	137	28	20.4

Figures denote students tested comparing those who attended (90% or more) and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Reading, it can be noted that approximately 20 to 50 percent of the students passed in each group. Considering that those students who attended the Extended Day Program were the lower performing students—i.e., those who were required to attend by contract—they may not have passed without this additional academic support.

	M A T H E M A T I C S					
	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	40	27	67.5	89	48	53.9
Ferris High School	56	12	21.4	57	11	19.3
Lincoln High School	55	16	29.1	119	22	18.5
Snyder High School	36	13	36.1	114	17	14.9

Figures denote students tested comparing those who attended (90% or more) and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Mathematics, it can be noted that the number of students who attended the program passed at higher rates than those that did not attend. Considering that those students who attended the Extended Day Program were the lower performing students—i.e., those who were required to attend by contract—they may not have passed without this additional academic support.

	WRITING					
	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	77	24	31.2	68	51	75.0
Ferris High School	59	16	27.1	55	24	43.6
Lincoln High School	37	15	40.5	79	29	36.7
Snyder High School	25	9	36.0	62	17	27.4

Figures denote students tested comparing those who attended (90% or more) and those that did not attend Extended Day HSPT Prep classes.

In Writing, it can be noted that the number of students who took advantage of the Extended Day Program and those who passed the HSPT were considerable in number. Considering that those students who attended the Extended Day Program were the lower performing students—i.e., those who were required to attend by contract—they may not have passed without this additional academic support. Although some schools must strengthen their writing programs, continuation of the Extended Day Program will offer the students another avenue for receiving academic support.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)													
LANGUAGE ARTS							MATHEMATICS						
SCHOOL	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	
#3	27	24	88.9	1	1	100.0	27	15	55.6	1	0	0.0	
#5	33	30	90.9	0	0	0.0	33	28	84.8	0	0	0.0	
#6	42	36	85.7	34	32	94.1	42	18	42.9	34	29	85.3	
#8	18	17	94.4	64	49	76.6	18	10	55.6	64	35	54.7	
#9	11	4	36.4	16	15	93.8	11	3	27.3	16	10	62.5	
#11	22	19	86.4	23	14	60.9	22	16	72.7	23	16	69.6	
#12	13	9	69.2	22	12	54.5	13	2	15.4	22	3	13.6	
#14	34	19	55.9	16	9	56.3	34	8	23.5	14	6	42.9	
#15	47	19	40.4	13	3	23.1	47	5	10.6	13	3	23.1	
#16	25	23	92.0	0	0	0.0	25	14	56.0	0	0	0.0	
#17	37	22	59.5	47	43	91.5	45	17	37.8	38	28	73.7	
#22	48	31	64.6	14	7	50.0	48	12	25.0	14	2	14.3	
#23	22	16	72.7	45	44	97.8	22	12	54.5	45	37	82.2	
#24	77	69	89.6	23	22	95.7	77	46	59.7	23	9	39.1	
#25	68	68	100.0	19	16	84.2	68	55	80.9	18	12	66.7	
#27	40	35	87.5	39	38	97.4	40	31	77.5	39	34	87.2	
#28	31	26	83.9	40	37	92.5	35	10	28.6	36	26	72.2	
#34	18	7	38.9	50	35	70.0	18	1	5.6	50	20	40.0	
#37	Did not have an Extended Day Program. School-wide program had test preparation built into the regular schedule.												
#38	42	32	76.2	51	48	94.1	42	15	35.7	51	35	68.6	
#39	7	5	71.4	24	18	75.0	7	4	57.1	25	10	40.0	
#40	24	14	58.3	100	79	79.0	24	6	25.0	101	58	57.4	
#41	31	26	83.9	45	9	20.0	31	4	12.9	45	1	2.2	
Acad. I	73	40	54.8	38	24	63.2	73	34	46.6	39	23	59.0	
Acad. II	29	14	48.3	39	4	10.3	29	2	6.9	43	3	7.0	
TOTAL S	819	605	73.9	763	559	73.3	831	368	44.3	754	400	53.1	

Please note: Passing rates are calculated for only those students who attended Extended Day classes with 90% attendance.

In analyzing the overall success of the Extended Day Program towards improving GEPA scores, it can be noted that, in Language Arts, students passed at the same rate, whether or not they attended the program. However, students attended as required by contract because they were identified in need of academic support. The passing rate for those who attended the language arts program was 73.9 as compared to 73.3 for those who did not. We feel that this is a commendable showing for at-risk students who may not have achieved passing grades without the academic support opportunities that are offered. It must be noted that at-risk students may have special needs but have not been classified, or they may have recently exited bilingual programs.

In math, a much weaker area than language arts, the showing was not as good. However, three hundred sixty-eight (368) students who attended were able to achieve passing scores on the GEPA in this subject area. Further analysis on the school level might indicate that certain schools must monitor attendance to ensure that students attend 90 percent of the time or that their programs need strengthening in order to offer their students a better chance for success.

The lowest performing schools are those which historically have struggled to meet with success. Through measures to address low performing schools and Whole School Reform efforts, some of their unique needs may be met.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)																		
SCHOOL	LANGUAGE ARTS						MATHEMATICS						SCIENCE					
	ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			ATTENDED EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#3	36	16	44.4	3	1	33.3	36	19	52.7	3	0	0.0	36	29	80.6	3	3	100.0
#5	40	21	52.5	2	0	0.0	40	18	45.0	2	2	100.0	40	32	80.0	2	2	100.0
#6	65	33	50.7	37	11	29.7	65	30	46.1	37	18	48.6	65	55	84.6	37	28	75.6
#8	39	24	61.5	75	12	16.0	39	23	58.9	75	43	57.3	39	31	79.4	76	57	75.0
#9	21	17	81.0	24	5	20.8	21	15	71.4	24	13	54.2	21	20	95.2	24	16	66.7
#11	33	23	70.0	44	8	18.2	33	15	45.5	44	35	79.5	33	27	81.8	44	37	84.0
#12	35	10	28.6	7	0	0.0	35	11	31.4	7	2	28.6	35	25	71.4	8	6	75.0
#14	28	11	39.3	36	3	8.3	28	3	10.7	36	21	58.3	28	13	46.4	35	21	60.0
#15	71	13	18.3	42	1	2.3	71	16	22.5	42	6	14.3	71	37	52.1	41	13	31.7
#16	27	15	55.6	6	1	16.7	27	18	66.6	6	4	66.7	27	23	85.1	6	6	100.0
#17	41	30	73.2	78	9	11.5	41	6	14.6	78	25	32.1	41	23	56.1	80	50	62.5
#20	9	8	88.9	59	17	28.8	9	2	22.2	59	19	32.2	9	5	55.5	61	41	67.2
#22	50	13	26.0	21	4	19.0	50	12	24.0	21	7	33.3	50	22	44.0	21	13	61.9
#23	30	24	80.0	89	13	14.6	30	10	33.3	89	54	60.7	30	21	70.0	89	68	76.4
#24	71	26	36.6	4	1	25.0	71	32	45.0	4	3	75.0	71	50	70.4	4	4	100.0
#25	117	45	38.5	19	9	47.4	117	70	59.8	19	9	47.4	117	97	82.9	19	13	68.4
#27	18	17	94.4	100	32	32.0	18	3	16.6	100	53	53.0	18	10	55.5	100	71	71.0
#28	41	38	92.7	64	10	15.6	41	19	46.3	64	45	70.3	41	32	78.0	65	58	89.2
#29	23	4	17.4	23	1	4.3	23	6	26.0	23	4	17.4	23	12	52.1	23	8	34.7
#30	40	13	32.5	47	3	6.4	40	13	32.5	47	17	36.2	40	28	70.0	48	30	62.5
#33	24	19	79.2	42	32	76.2	24	18	75.0	42	36	85.7	24	22	91.6	42	40	95.2
#34	6	5	83.3	62	12	19.4	6	0	0	62	16	25.8	6	3	50.0	63	31	49.2
#38	11	9	81.8	81	17	21.0	11	2	18.1	81	38	46.9	11	5	45.4	81	59	72.8
#39	2	1	50.0	57	3	5.3	2	2	100.0	57	10	17.5	2	2	100.0	58	21	36.2
#41	63	14	22.2	27	3	11.1	63	19	30.1	27	6	22.2	63	32	50.8	25	8	32.0
#42	21	19	90.5	11	2	18.2	21	12	57.1	11	6	54.5	21	14	66.6	11	9	81.8

Please note: Passing rates are calculated for only those students who attended Extended Day classes with 90% attendance.

In analyzing passing rates of students who attended and did not attend Extended Day Programs with a 90% attendance rate, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Some schools had few students attend on a regular basis (90% of the time). The majority did not attend. Guidance counselors and head teachers should have been aggressive in ensuring participation of students who did not participate and in tracking attendance to keep students in the program. Some students who did not attend may have benefited from attendance in the programs.
- Percent passing who attended the Extended Day Program must be viewed with caution when few students attended.
- Students who attended, in many cases, were those who attended by contract (at-risk students). Many who passed may not have passed without the support of the program.

Super Saturdays

- Implement a “Super Saturdays Program” at four elementary schools and one or two high schools, available to all district students (based on projected enrollments). Low staff/student ratio will provide for individualization of instruction.

Successful ☐

Unsuccessful ☒

Explanation of Success:

Passing rates of those high school students who attended Super Saturdays as outlined on the following charts indicate that the classes offered, while they may upgrade the skills of its attendees, are not producing the results we had anticipated. Few students attended and passing rates are well below those of the students who did not attend the program.

The following charts compare the percentage of students passing the HSPT in April 2000 who did and did not attend Super Saturdays HSPT classes. Students who attended the Super Saturdays Program were required to attend 70 percent of the classes in order to receive credit for attendance. Many students attended these classes but not 70% of the time. Some reasons may be:

1. Classes were only offered in one high school and students from all sections of the city had to travel to this site which was a distance from some neighborhoods.
2. Classes for the Super Saturdays program were designed primarily for fun, personal interest and enrichment. Students were given the opportunity to hone HSPT skills on Saturdays if they were not able to take advantage of the after school Extended Day HSPT Prep classes. However, students were not mandated to attend Super Saturdays HSPT classes.
3. Students may have opted to attend classes of personal interest rather than the HSPT Prep classes.

Upon analysis of the test data, it became apparent that:

1. Some students who had not attended 70 percent of Super Saturdays classes passed section(s) of the HSPT.

2. Many students who began the program did not participate in 70 percent of classes.

Considering the low number of students who took advantage of this academic support on a regular basis, it must be concluded that this program has not been effective toward improving students' test scores. The district put much time and preparation into the HSPT Super Saturdays Program. Unfortunately, the attendance records indicate that students who had not passed sections of the test previously did not attend these classes on a regular basis.

Prior to the start of the 1999-2000 Super Saturdays Program, district staff met to decide if HSPT Prep classes should remain a part of the Super Saturdays Program. Many more students attended the 1999 Summer HSPT Institute than the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes; therefore, the decision was made to focus future efforts on providing academic support during the summer institute and at individual high schools during Extended Day classes and to make test prep classes at Super Saturdays voluntary. (See analysis of HSPT Summer Institute below.)

SUBJECT AREA	1999 SUMMER HSPT INSTITUTE		
	# of Students Who Attended	# of Students Who Passed	% of Students Who Passed
Reading	91	19	20.9
Mathematics	61	23	37.7
Writing	60	12	20.0

	READING					
	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	12 of 21	0	0.0	86	42	48.8
Ferris High School	28 of 29	1	3.6	73	29	39.7
Lincoln High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	107	46	43.0
Snyder High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	88	24	27.3

Tested (Attended column) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with a 70% or better attendance rate. For example, at Dickinson High School, 21 students attended the program regularly, but only 12 took the HSPT in April.

Tested (Did Not Attend column) refers to the number of students who were tested in April (did not pass in October 1999) and did not attend the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes.

	M A T H E M A T I C S					
	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	2 of 12	1	50.0	58	36	62.1
Ferris High School	16 of 17 (includes 1 not scored)	2	12.5	47	12	25.5
Lincoln High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	93	27	29.0
Snyder High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	70	21	30.0

Tested (Attended column) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with a 70% or better attendance rate. For example, at Dickinson High School, 12 students attended the program regularly, but only 2 took the HSPT in April.

Tested (Did Not Attend column) refers to the number of students who were tested in April (did not pass in October 1999) and did not attend the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes.

	WRITING					
	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
Dickinson High School	12 of 21	1	8.3	58	36	62.1
Ferris High School	28 of 29	5	17.9	43	23	53.5
Lincoln High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	67	29	43.3
Snyder High School	0 of 0	0	0.0	42	14	33.3

Tested (Attended column) refers to the number of students tested of the number who attended this program with a 70% or better attendance rate. For example, at Dickinson High School, 21 students attended the program regularly, but only 12 took the HSPT in April.

Tested (Did Not Attend column) refers to the number of students who were tested in April (did not pass in October 1999) and did not attend the Super Saturdays HSPT Prep classes.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)												
SCHOOL	LANGUAGE ARTS						MATHEMATICS					
	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#5	3	3	100.0	30	27	90.0	0	0	0.0	33	28	84.8
#8	55	46	83.6	27	20	74.1	57	33	57.9	25	12	48.0
#9	0	0	0.0	27	19	70.4	1	1	100.0	26	12	46.2
#16	1	1	100.0	24	22	91.7	1	1	100.0	24	13	54.2
#17	0	0	0.0	84	65	77.4	4	2	50.0	79	43	54.4
#23	0	0	0.0	67	60	89.6	1	0	0.0	66	49	74.2
#24	1	1	100.0	99	90	90.9	2	1	50.0	98	54	55.1
#25	2	1	50.0	85	83	97.6	1	1	100.0	85	66	77.6
#27	4	4	100.0	75	69	92.0	4	3	75.0	75	62	82.7
#28	1	1	100.0	70	62	88.6	1	1	100.0	70	35	50.0
#34	6	2	33.3	62	40	64.5	2	1	50.0	66	20	30.3
#38	4	3	75.0	89	77	86.5	6	1	16.7	87	49	56.3
#39	4	4	100.0	27	19	70.4	11	6	54.5	21	8	38.1
#40	4	3	75.0	120	90	75.0	5	1	20.0	120	63	52.5
Acad. I	1	0	0.0	110	64	58.2	2	0	0.0	110	57	51.8
TOTAL S	86	69	80.2	996	807	81.0	98	52	53.1	985	571	58.0

Please note: Passing rates are calculated for only those students who attended Super Saturdays classes with 70% attendance.

Although 4th and 8th grade at-risk students were required to attend academic support classes offered on Saturdays or after school, many did not attend on a regular basis. An analysis of attendance data from the Super Saturdays Program indicates that students who took the GEPA attended from 15 (above noted) of the 25 schools and only 86 (Language Arts) and 98 (Mathematics) attended at least 70 percent of the time. Passing rates between students who attended and did not attend the Super Saturdays Program for GEPA Prep in all schools, with the exception of P.S. #8, cannot be compared, as the number of students who attended were minimal. In P.S. #8, a Super Saturdays site, attendance of P.S. #8 students was mandated for at-risk students by school personnel. In that instance, of eight-two (82) 8th grade students, approximately two-thirds of the class attended each section, and both Language Arts and Math performance was better for those students who attended the GEPA Prep classes than those who did not.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)												
	LANGUAGE ARTS						MATHEMATICS					
	ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			ATTENDED SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM			DID NOT ATTEND SUPER SATURDAYS PROGRAM		
SCHOOL	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing	# Tested	# Passing	% Passing
#5	0	--	--	42	21	50.0	18	10	55.6	24	11	45.8
#8	36	21	58.3	79	14	17.7	7	7	100.0	107	59	55.1
#12	0	--	--	41	10	24.4	2	2	100.0	40	11	27.5
#15	1	1	100.0	111	25	22.5	1	1	100.0	112	21	18.8
#16	0	--	--	33	16	48.5	1	1	100.0	32	21	65.6
#17	4	2	50.0	119	34	29.0	1	0	0.0	118	31	26.3
#20	2	2	100.0	67	21	31.3	1	0	0.0	67	21	31.3
#23	2	1	50.0	117	31	26.5	1	1	100.0	118	63	53.4
#24	0	--	--	75	27	36.0	1	1	100.0	74	37	50.0
#25	2	1	50.0	134	55	41.0	1	0	0.0	135	79	58.5
#27	8	5	62.5	110	41	37.0	7	4	57.1	111	52	46.8
#28	1	1	100.0	104	46	44.2	2	2	100.0	103	62	60.2
#30	1	1	100.0	87	27	31.0	2	1	50.0	85	29	34.1
#34	10	6	60.0	59	9	15.3	4	2	50.0	64	14	21.9
#38	2	1	50.0	90	44	48.8	1	1	100.0	91	39	42.9

Please note: Passing rates are calculated for only those students who attended Super Saturdays classes with 70% attendance.

In analyzing the performance of students who attended ESPA Prep classes, it became evident that students were not mandated to attend—hence the low enrollment. It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of the Super Saturdays Program as a test preparation vehicle. In most cases, students received ESPA prep at the school level during the Extended Day Program and participated in enrichment offerings during Super Saturdays.

Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages (page 27)

Plan for 1999-2000 implementation of World Languages at the elementary level. Include continuation of a World Language Task Force; recruitment of additional teachers; development of curriculum; purchase of materials; and, training of teachers during the school year and during a summer institute.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The World Languages Program (Spanish), begun in 1998-99, was expanded to grades 3 and 6 during the 1999-00 school year. The chart on page 45 outlines student performance as noted on final report cards.

Report card grades show:

- In grade 2, the overwhelming majority of students scored 3 and 4—the highest grades.
- Of 2938 third graders, 2869 (or 97.7%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2738 fifth graders, 2691 (or 98.3%) were successful in passing this subject.
- Of 2404 sixth graders, 2338 (or 97.3%) were successful in passing this subject.

WORLD LANGUAGES - Report Card Grades

SCHOOL	GRADE 2				GRADE 3					GRADE 5					GRADE 6				
	1	2	3	4	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A	F	C	C+	B	A
P.S. #1	Bilingual School—No World Language classes																		
P.S. #3	0	6	4	11	1	8	2	14	13	0	2	0	5	36	0	0	2	11	28
P.S. #5	0	4	35	42	0	0	0	37	36	0	3	5	39	12	0	0	4	23	21
P.S. #6	0	2	33	47	0	7	13	29	56	0	3	7	24	77	1	3	4	21	86
P.S. #8	2	10	61	33	0	1	6	61	60	0	9	0	38	67	2	0	7	43	38
P.S. #9	0	5	44	12	0	3	8	62	13	4	9	10	32	8	0	4	6	40	6
P.S. #11	1	0	36	34	0	12	3	43	42	0	8	16	34	34	0	13	11	26	30
P.S. #12	0	5	33	11	0	6	0	42	15	0	2	0	29	14	0	1	0	18	12
P.S. #14	1	34	13	5	12	42	1	7	8	2	27	1	22	20	1	14	0	12	17
P.S. #15	5	42	40	6	3	34	26	45	9	5	41	15	25	23	1	25	27	20	6
P.S. #16	0	12	23	6	0	9	2	28	2	0	6	0	28	6	0	14	0	17	3
P.S. #17	0	33	72	37	0	85	0	94	86	6	34	0	97	43	10	25	0	85	25
P.S. #20	0	26	51	53	1	49	8	27	17	0	9	5	24	68					
P.S. #22	0	4	35	55	15	34	15	14	17	1	8	27	39	28	17	22	9	23	4
P.S. #23	0	7	57	80	0	29	9	64	64	0	13	0	47	65	0	2	9	55	38
P.S. #24	0	9	42	54	3	39	0	22	22	1	29	0	43	58	6	74	0	5	47
P.S. #25	0	5	92	27	3	34	3	65	24	0	0	23	76	40	0	0	37	69	38
P.S. #27	0	14	59	50	0	9	24	58	27	0	24	12	74	27	0	38	9	42	13
P.S. #28	0	7	13	99	0	0	7	13	99	0	0	6	60	58	0	3	0	39	67
P.S. #29	1	7	55	1	1	9	16	32	4										
P.S. #30	2	5	10	41	2	4	2	70	32	0	0	2	33	42					
P.S. #33	0	11	39	26	0	11	14	34	29										
P.S. #34	2	38	38	17	0	22	25	52	10	1	31	0	32	21	0	6	12	32	24
P.S. #37	0	27	19	18	2	36	0	27	7	0	32	0	26	4	0	84	0	11	0
P.S. #38	0	5	44	39	2	11	0	42	46	2	24	0	49	25	4	25	0	53	34
P.S. #39	0	13	12	31	0	8	14	44	4	0	4	10	36	10	0	10	3	16	6
P.S. #40										N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	34	0	78	40
P.S. #41	8	44	132	144	24	0	72	120	172	25	158	118	179	81	12	44	64	168	64
P.S. #42	0	0	9	28	0	1	5	13	18										
Academy I															0	1	5	14	48
Academy II															8	23	18	19	11
TOTALS:	22	375	1101	1007	69	503	275	1159	932	47	476	257	1091	867	66	465	227	940	706

Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program (page 28)

Forty-nine (49) Reading Recovery teachers are assigned to address the needs of the elementary schools.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

This program has been met with enthusiasm on the part of teachers and parents for the results it yields. During the past year, nine additional Reading Recovery teachers were added, bringing the number of trained Reading Recovery staff to fifty-eight (58). The three (3) teacher leaders and fifty-five (55) reading recovery teachers went through intensive training and continued professional development sessions so that they would be prepared to prevent reading problems through early intervention in the first grade. The commitment to service the lowest performing 20 percent of first graders continues.

Preliminary data indicate that 475 first grade children were serviced by Jersey City's Reading Recovery teachers during the 1999-00 school year. Of this total, 223 (or 47%) have met the criteria for successfully completing the program. This means they ended the year reading at or very near grade level. Data from the school district's Reading Recovery follow-up studies allow us to predict that the majority of these children will maintain these early gains through grade 3.

Approximately 20 Reading Recovery students are continuing to receive tutorial services during summer school. This will increase the total who successfully complete the program.

A final report from the Reading Recovery National Data and Evaluation Center at Ohio State University will be forthcoming in November. This report will detail the progress of Reading Recovery students, as well as two comparison groups on six literacy measures.

Alternative Education (page 29)

Continue implementation and expansion of our alternative education programs and strategies to address the needs of the at-risk population in the Jersey City Public Schools. These programs will include: Academy I; Academy II; the Boys' Club Alternative Program; P.S. 29 Annex; "*Making Better Choices*"; and, "*fifteen together*."

Plan for alternative high school to service fifty (50) 9th graders and expand over a 4-year period by admitting fifty (50) 9th graders per year.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

At the Boys/Girls' Club and P.S. 29 Annex, district Zero Tolerance sites, students stay on the average 10 days.

Students may attend the Better Choices Program for no more than one entire marking period. During the 1999-00 school year, thirty-three (33) students attended.

A review of performance at Academy I and Academy II indicates that, with the exception of Language Arts scores at Academy II, students who took the GEPA in 2000 did not fare as well as students who took the test last year. However, if students were in larger, more impersonal settings, they may not have produced even these results. Information from the Bank Street College of Education (as noted below in Liberty High School's final report) supports the importance of small schools towards helping special populations achieve. In order to address the needs of students who struggle to perform at higher levels, both schools will be implementing Whole School Reform models in September (Academy I—Coalition of Essential Schools; Academy II—America's Choice). America's Choice was selected because it is a literacy-based model that the school community identified as necessary for the school population.

After two years in operation, the *fifteen together* program can be considered an overwhelming success. Cohort I students

are entering the 11th grade. Two years ago, elementary guidance counselors, principals and teachers expressed the concern that, without mentors, these at-risk students would not be in school for their junior year. With the guidance of mentor/counselors, 63.9 percent of the three hundred thirty-three (333) students who began this program in the summer of 1998 prepare to enter their junior year. Some will become peer counselors for students who are entering Cohort III. After one year of participation, 80.9 percent of the three hundred thirty-one (331) students who began the program in the summer of 1999 are still participating. On July 5, 2000, over three hundred (300) students entered Cohort III. This is an excellent success rate in addressing our dropout problem. Normally, students who have high rates of absenteeism, are dissatisfied with school, have failed in the past and are overage would not have persevered without adult intervention.

The following information was taken from *Liberty High School—First Year Report, June 2000*, the alternative high school mentioned above which opened in the fall of 1999. Included in the *Report* is a press release conducted by the Bank Street College of Education which concludes that smaller schools produce better results than larger schools in key areas related to student success:

- They are safer. There is less violence and less vandalism.
- Student attendance is better.
- There are fewer dropouts.
- More students pass their subjects.
- Test scores are generally higher than those of comparable students in larger schools.

The *Report* from Liberty High School bears out these claims.

Violence:

During the course of the year, there were a total of three (3) fights. In each case, no weapons were used and no significant damage was done. All the students who fought were suspended and none repeated the offense.

Vandalism:

There were three (3) incidents of graffiti inside the building. Student work was displayed regularly throughout the year in classrooms, in the cafeteria and in the hallways. None was ever damaged or defaced. There were no occasions of deliberate damage to the fabric, furnishings or equipment of the school.

Suspensions for All Reasons:

During the year, there were a total of seventeen (17) suspensions. Eleven (11) students were suspended, two (2) twice and two (2) three times.

Student Attendance:

The attendance rate was over 90 percent throughout the year. The students won the \$1,000 attendance challenge from the Superintendent with a one-week rate of over 95 percent. That was not far over the average rate.

As several students complained, they had no chance to be absent without its being reported to their parents: the family of every student who was absent received a call each time he/she was absent. The families of students who came late got phone calls as well.

Dropout Rate:

If dropouts are counted as students who left Liberty as the final step in their high school careers, there were no dropouts. Once the school had moved into its permanent site, three students transferred because they had moved out of town (one of those three is returning to Jersey City and will rejoin the school in the 10th grade), one moved within the city, across the street from a high school in which she had several relatives, and two left at mid-year to return to their neighborhood schools.

It is true that freshmen are usually too young to drop out of school, but Liberty had an older than usual freshman class, with a number of students who are 16 and older. The oldest students are now 18.

Curriculum:

All students studied a curriculum that included:

- freshman English;
- pre-algebra and algebra 1;
- world history and cultures;
- earth science;

- computer business applications;
- career education;
- computer art or current issues in social studies; and,
- physical education.

Passing Rate in Courses:

Disaggregated by subject, the passing rate for the year in major academic courses was as follows:

Pre-Algebra and Algebra:	94% passed	6% failed
English 1:	94% passed	6% failed
Earth Science:	88% passed	12% failed
World History & Cultures:	88% passed	12% failed

All students who failed any course offered in summer school were given registration papers, and they and their parents were notified of the need to attend summer school. Five students attended.

Extracurricular Activities Available to Students and Extent of Participation:

The Extended Day Program offered the following:

- Tutoring in English, math, science, social studies, and computers. All students attended Extended Day activities at some point during the year.
- Students took advantage of the chance to try out for sports teams at their neighborhood schools. Three students made the teams and played major sports—two in basketball for Lincoln and one in football for Snyder.
- This summer's *fifteen together* program, with Cohorts 1 and 2, will meet at Liberty.

Unique Opportunities Offered Through Partnership with Hudson County Community College:

- College classes were held in the building during the day. It is typical of Middle College programs that student behavior improves while college students are present in the building with high school classes. There were no incidents involving conflicts between high school and college students.
- College tutors began to be available in the spring term to assist with math, English, social studies. These tutors were funded through the Gear Up program, through the efforts of EOF Director, Mr. Frank Alston.

- College mentors were available briefly, late in the spring term—again through the efforts of Mr. Alston.
- All Liberty students had college, as well as high school IDs, and were able to use the college's library and computer labs.
- Most Liberty students (on a voluntary basis) were allowed to take the college's placement tests in math and English to find out how close they were to being ready to take college classes for credit.
- Next year, all students who wish to, will be able to take the one-hour per week College Survival Skills course as part of a regularly scheduled college section.

Registration for 2000-01:

There are fifty-seven (57) students enrolled in the 9th grade—most attended an Orientation Meeting in June. In addition, there were three (3) new students admitted to the 10th grade—to replace students who have left the city. Applications continue to be received, and new applicants are advised that they will be placed on a waiting list, should new openings occur.

HSPT/HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development (page 30)

District supervisors will:

- Provide staff development beginning in the summer of 1999 and extending throughout the school year across the district (particularly in the high schools) in Reading, Writing and Math, with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas;
- Review test specifications;
- Explain use of various rubrics;
- Provide appropriate test preparation materials;
- Demonstrate how effective strategies may be incorporated into the everyday curriculum during ongoing workshops;
- Receive updates on implementation of plans from principals;
- Visit high school classrooms at least two times a week to ensure and assess implementation of strategies and materials; and,
- Analyze and prepare reports for teachers regarding deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills.

Vice principals will:

- Monitor HSPT/HSPA implementation in their assigned content areas on a daily basis and submit weekly reports to the Associate Superintendent of Instruction.

Every 9th grade student will be given a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments.

Successful

☒

Unsuccessful

☐

Explanation of Success:

All staff development initiatives are based on needs assessment, and the focus is on improving student performance. All staff members, regular and special education teachers, as well as support staff (child study team, guidance counselors) attended the same academic and inclusion workshops. District efforts have been aimed at upgrading professional development of special education teachers so that all students will reap the benefits of teacher training in effective strategies and instruction. In addition to the workshops outlined below, special education teachers joined regular education staff during Prentice Hall workshops, as new reading anthologies were introduced to ninth grade classes. The effectiveness of our training efforts is difficult to determine. For example, the benefits of inclusion and reading workshops that teachers are attending will not be known until the students whom they teach take State assessments.

DATE	GROUP	TOPIC
September 8, 1999	Pre-School Handicapped Inclusion Teacher	Inclusion
September 8, 1999	All Elementary Teachers	N.J.A.C. 6A:14 Inclusion Successful Classroom Teacher Aide/Assistant Collaboration
September 8, 1999	All Elementary Teacher Assistants and Aides	N.J.A.C. 6A:14 Inclusion Teacher Collaboration
September 8, 1999	All High School Teachers	Inclusion Subject Area Concerns
October 20, 27 November 3, 10, 17, 24 December 1, 8, 15, 22 January 12, 19 February 2, 9, 23 March 1, 8, 15	Teachers (343)	IEP Management (Vision System)
March 29-30	Elementary Teachers (20)	Project Read Linguistics
April 12-13	Elementary Teachers (19)	Project Read (Linguistics)

Other staff development opportunities that were offered on September 8, 1999, addressed the Core Curriculum Content Standards, Cross Content/Workplace Readiness Standards, use of technology across the curriculum, problem-based learning and assessment using technology, conflict resolution, language arts across the curriculum, and interrelationship

of math and other disciplines to the real world. In addition, staff is beginning to infuse language arts in content area information across grade levels, as high school teachers are presenting to their colleagues in the elementary schools.

The goal of the Whole School Reform (WSR) movement is to improve students' academic performance. To that end, many WSR initiatives were undertaken, including implementation of models in Cohort II Schools and exploration for Mid-Year Second Cohort and Cohort III Schools. School staffs began taking responsibility for test analysis with assistance of district supervisors and articulating their needs for staff development. Guidance counselors were involved in registering at-risk students for ESPA and GEPA Prep classes and professional development was designed to raise awareness of staff and better prepare students for the State assessments. Senior Staff members and district supervisors worked in the following low performing elementary schools from January through May giving on-site staff development via in-class support, assistance with mid-term exam analysis (aligned to the State assessments) and test skill development across the curriculum.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)							
SCHOOL	LANGUAGE ARTS			MATHEMATICS			SCIENCE
	1998-99*	1999-00*	DIFFERENCE	1998-99*	1999-00*	DIFFERENCE	1999-00
P.S. #12	59.1	60.0	+0.9	17.8	14.3	-3.5	25.7
P.S. #14	61.4	56.0	-5.4	30.2	29.2	-1.0	43.8
P.S. #15	54.8	36.7	-18.1	16.7	13.4	-3.3	16.9
P.S. #22	63.2	61.3	-1.9	22.9	22.6	-0.3	14.5
P.S. #34	62.7	61.8	-0.9	35.3	30.9	-4.4	23.6
P.S. #39	56.1	74.2	+18.1	29.3	43.8	+14.5	34.4
P.S. #41	36.9	46.1	+9.2	5.9	6.6	+0.7	19.7
*Figures as reported on School Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 8/19/99 and 8/14/00)							

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)									
SCHOOL	LANGUAGE ARTS			MATHEMATICS			SCIENCE		
	1998-99*	1999-00*	DIFF.	1998-99*	1999-00*	DIFF.	1998-99*	1999-00*	DIFF.
P.S. #12	31.1	24.4	-6.7	24.4	31.0	+6.6	53.4	72.1	+18.7
P.S. #14	9.2	22.2	+13.0	20.6	37.5	+16.9	42.6	54.0	+11.4
P.S. #15	12.1	12.5	+0.4	17.3	19.5	+2.2	40.3	44.7	+4.4
P.S. #22	14.9	23.9	+9.0	29.7	26.8	-2.9	43.8	49.3	+5.5
P.S. #34	17.7	24.6	+6.9	9.3	23.6	+14.3	41.9	49.2	+7.3
P.S. #39	12.1	6.7	-5.4	11.7	20.3	+8.6	47.5	38.3	-9.2
P.S. #41	21.9	19.1	-2.8	38.1	27.8	-10.3	52.4	45.5	-6.9
*Figures as reported on School Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 9/14/99 and 9/26/00)									

The consensus of opinion during follow-up meetings was that, although this initiative did not produce significant gains, it was worthwhile and should be continued for the 2000-01 school year, beginning in September rather than this year's January start date.

An analysis of student performance on the HSPT indicates that, overall, student test scores continue to improve. As previously mentioned (on page 12), an analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the GEPA indicates that, of the 25 schools (with 8th grade classes), 12 have improved performance from last year, and 8 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the GEPA indicates that, overall, 12 schools have improved performance from last year and 3 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in math, we believe these figures show progress due to analysis of student performance, staff development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student achievement.

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the ESPA indicates that, of the 27 schools (with 4th grade classes), 19 have improved performance from last year, and 5 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the ESPA indicates that, overall, 14 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. And, on the Science section of the ESPA, 13 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in all three subject areas, we believe that, as the entire school community participates in the Whole School Reform process, all stakeholders will become familiar with test specifications and the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. Coupled with the district's emphasis on staff development and effective, uniform initiatives, our children will ultimately

reach their full potential.

Corrective Action Plans (page 32)

- All administrators attend staff development on how to write Corrective Action Plans (CAP) with benchmarks.
- After Comprehensive School Assessment visits, the administrators develop a plan with the assistance of staff and SMT members to set improvement goals for areas found deficient during CSA visits.
- Plans are read by Associate Superintendent of Instruction and reviewed to see if actions noted will result in correction of deficiencies. Plans are then approved or rejected. Rejected plans require further development.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

This strategy was implemented, but modified for the 1999-00 school year. The Associate Superintendent of Instruction visited schools alone and wrote a report on what she observed. School administrators were required to submit Corrective Action Plans to her office, which she reviewed and approved or helped to modify.

The CSA served a purpose during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years. It raised principals and staffs' awareness of district expectations in seven areas: Curriculum Congruence, Assessment, High Expectations, Time on Task, Organization & Management, Instructional Effectiveness, and Overall School Comparisons. The initiative established uniform expectations for all schools and raised awareness of strategies that were successful in transforming low performing schools to successful ones.

An analysis of student performance on the HSPT indicates that, overall, student test scores continue to improve. As previously mentioned (on page 12), an analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the GEPA indicates that, of the 25 schools (with 8th grade classes), 12 have improved performance from last year, and 8 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the GEPA indicates that, overall, 12 schools have improved performance from last year and 3 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a

way to go in math, we believe these figures show progress due to analysis of student performance, staff development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student achievement.

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the ESPA indicates that, of the 27 schools (with 4th grade classes), 19 have improved performance from last year, and 5 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the ESPA indicates that, overall, 14 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. And, on the Science section of the ESPA, 13 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in all three subject areas, we believe that, as the entire school community participates in the Whole School Reform process, all stakeholders will become familiar with test specifications and the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. Coupled with the district's emphasis on staff development and effective, uniform initiatives, our children will ultimately reach their full potential.

Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students (page 33)

In accordance with our school-level plans which focus on our lowest performing schools, measures will be taken as follows:

- Based on multiple measures, it will be recommended that 4th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturdays classes and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on spring ESPA, it will be recommended that 5th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturdays and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grades 3 and 6 will attend the "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness (reading, writing, math and science).
- Based on a fall GEPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) and teacher judgment, 8th grade students identified as at risk must attend GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes and/or Super Saturdays programs to ensure graduation.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, January GEPA practice test (The Learning Consortium), teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grade 7 will attend the GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturdays and/or GEPA Summer Institute to focus on areas of weakness.
- By October 1999, guidance counselors are to meet with 4th and 8th grade at-risk students and their parents/guardians to secure signed contracts of agreement to participate in ESPA and GEPA academic support programs.

Successful

☒

Unsuccessful

☐

Explanation of Success:

Academic support is not only offered to 4th and 8th graders, but also to students in the “off” grades. This focus, across grade levels, is beginning to yield results, as expectations for all students are high.

Although 4th and 8th grade at-risk students were required to attend academic support classes offered on Saturdays or after school, many did not attend on a regular basis. An analysis of attendance data from the Super Saturdays Program indicates that students who took the GEPA attended from 15 of 25 schools and only 86 (Language Arts) and 98 (Mathematics) attended at least 70 percent of the time. Of the students who attended Extended Day classes conducted by all elementary schools, over eight hundred (800) students attended at least 90 percent of the time. Since these academic support offerings are offered to students in grades 3 through 8, continuation of this strategy will ensure future success.

Staff Development Linked to Supervision (page 35)

- Staff development opportunities will be developed as a result of supervision and instruction. This needs assessment will result in an expansion of the traditional forms of professional development into a comprehensive, ongoing program closely linked to district- and school-level educational plans, New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, and student performance standards. Means of providing ongoing professional development include seminars and a Teacher Academy.
- Summer staff development opportunities include, but are not limited to:
 - *Integrating the "R" Word into the High School Curriculum* (for English, social studies and science teachers);
 - *PHL* (Prentice Hall Literature) and *HSPA: Perfect Together*;
 - *Two Heads are Better Than One: Three, Four and Five Heads are Best* (for high school teachers of all disciplines);
 - *Instructional Strategies for Teaching Algebra I and II in the Block*;
 - *Instructional Strategies for Teaching Geometry in the Block*;
 - *HSPT Strategies and Hands-On Activities*;
 - *Making the (Math) Connection with the Use of Technology* (presented by professors of math, computer science and engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology)
- Math teachers will be exposed to most recent approved techniques of effective math teaching through participation in classes provided by Eisenhower grant funding.

Successful



Unsuccessful



Explanation of Success:

Constant upgrading of staff knowledge, monitoring and support by district supervisors, assistance of Senior Staff members in lowest performing schools and implementation of Whole School Reform models is assuring that students are receiving instruction in line with Core Curriculum Content Standards which will produce success on State assessments.

Administrative Staff Development (page 37)

Principal Mentoring Program

The program provides novice and veteran building principals with intensive, high-level, one-on-one personal and professional support they can rely upon to meet the challenge of their critical positions in the schools and develop into effective, successful school leaders. The mentor in this program will be referred to as the principal's **associate**. The associate will truly act as a partner or professional companion of the principal. The mentor will be working with and supporting the efforts of the principal in action, on the job throughout the school year from September until May.

Administrative Internship Program

A Supportive Administrative Intern will work with a district supervisor, a building athletic director or other supervisory personnel for five (5) hours per week beyond the regular school day, while a School Administrative Intern will work with a building-level administrator for five (5) hours per week before school, during preparation periods and beyond the regular school day. The Supportive Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in two or three of the following areas; the School Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in each of the following areas:

- Curriculum development;
- Student management;
- Parent/community relations;
- School organization and management.

Principals' Institute

The intent of this staff development initiative is to raise awareness of current issues by providing speakers renowned in the field of education. New principals are given opportunities for growth at nearby universities, and all principals are apprised of workshops to address their individual needs.

Aspiring Administrators' Academy

This initiative provides staff members with training and exposure to the demands of an administrative position. It endeavors to provide models for effective and dynamic administrators.

Summer Academy

Administrators' Wednesday Seminars related to implementation of Whole School Reform are planned. Professional development opportunities are offered during the summer, including orientation for new teachers.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

In an effort to prepare prospective administrators during the 1999-00 school year, all of the above initiatives—with the exception of the Aspiring Administrators' Academy, which last took place during the 1998-99 school year—were continued. During those sessions, twenty-five to thirty staff members were in attendance. District personnel decided this Academy would be offered during alternating years, as the pool of applicants did not warrant yearly sessions.

Eleven first-year principals were assigned mentors for the 1999-00 school year through the Principal Mentoring Program, and the Administrative Internship Program placed seventeen staff members with central office supervisors and school principals. Of the seventeen, four became district supervisors, one a coordinator, and four assumed the role of head teacher during summer school sessions.

Thirteen people—three supervisors and ten assistant/vice principals—attended classes once a month from November through May at the Principals' Institute.

All strategies have been implemented, but in place of Comprehensive School Assessment (CSA) as conducted in the past, supervisors and central office administrators are working with administrative staff to ensure that their professional development is having a positive impact on school programs. Training opportunities will prepare prospective and novice administrators to lead schools to success in raising student performance.

Support by Administrative Staff (page 39)

- Supervisors were assigned an average of eighty staff evaluations during the course of the school year. Each supervisor cooperatively developed weekly schedules that reflected assignments to particular schools on a full-time basis during school hours.
- Supervisors who have the expertise and responsibility for the evaluation of staff have assumed an enhanced role as department chairpersons. They replaced former chairpersons, usually the best teachers, who were now returned to classrooms. Greater emphasis has been placed upon the quality of instruction. In addition to their responsibilities for observing instruction and evaluating staff, the department chairpersons also organize and present staff development workshops at the school site, as well as at conferences. They develop and distribute a monthly newsletter for all staff in their department. This newsletter directs attention to current developments in the field, instructional strategies and techniques, gives notice of current staff development opportunities and shares the accomplishments of students and staff.
- In addition to the department chairpersons, the position of department coordinator was created in the high schools. These individuals maintain a full teaching load and conduct their coordinator job responsibilities before and after school or on their free time. Their responsibilities include assisting and providing materials to staff.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

This system allowed the best teachers to be returned to classrooms. Students benefit from a lower student/teacher ratio.

ACCOUNTABILITY:

School Performance Targets (page 41)

- HSPT performance targets for the 1999-00 school year have been established in Reading, Mathematics and Writing for grade 11 students. These targets, along with student performance at each of our high schools, can be found in Appendix A. Achievement of grade 8 and 4 targets can also be found in Appendix A.
- Yearly, after final district test results are received, individual letters are sent to the principal of each school reviewing progress on student performance over the previous school year. Student performance is assessed on two distinct levels:
 - (1) Progress toward meeting the school's yearly benchmark; and,
 - (2) Progress toward meeting both the State and district standard of 85 percent passing in each subject area at the high school level and 75 percent passing at the elementary school level.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

By setting school performance targets and holding staff accountable for their attainment, all stakeholders reflect upon, evaluate and modify instructional strategies when scores are received in the district. Schools articulated the steps that were taken to prepare students for success. If results did not live up to expectations, future initiatives were planned to improve programs and delivery of instruction.

An analysis of student performance on the HSPT indicates that, overall, student test scores continue to improve. An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the GEPA indicates that, of the 25 schools (with 8th grade classes), 12 have improved performance from last year, and 8 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the GEPA indicates that, overall, 12 schools have improved performance from last year and 3 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in math, we believe

these figures show progress due to analysis of student performance, staff development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student achievement.

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the ESPA indicates that, of the 27 schools (with 4th grade classes), 19 have improved performance from last year, and 5 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the ESPA indicates that, overall, 14 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. And, on the Science section of the ESPA, 13 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in all three subject areas, we believe that, as the entire school community participates in the Whole School Reform process, all stakeholders will become familiar with test specifications and the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. Coupled with the district's emphasis on staff development and effective, uniform initiatives, our children will ultimately reach their full potential.

Comprehensive School Assessment (page 42)

Prior to visits by CSA, the Associate Superintendent of Instruction visits a school to provide feedback regarding areas that are evident as needing assistance.

The team will carefully analyze whether or not the curriculum is being implemented consistently and efficiently in all grade levels. Specific team members will observe instruction throughout the day vertically (e.g., k, 1, 2, 3, etc.), and other team members will observe instruction in a specific grade level or in grade level clusters (e.g., grades 3 and 4, grades 5 and 6, etc.). The team will determine the degree of articulation that exists in the school and whether the district curriculum is being consistently implemented throughout the school. The team will also analyze assessment practices, the level of student expectations, time on task, the organization and management of the instructional setting and the overall effectiveness of the school's instructional team.

Successful ☐

Unsuccessful ☐

Not Implemented as Planned ☒

Explanation of Success:

This strategy was modified for the 1999-00 school year. The Associate Superintendent for Instruction visited schools to ascertain whether the initial evaluations conducted during the 1998-99 school year were being addressed at the school level. School administrators were responsible for developing Corrective Action Plans with the guidance of the Associate Superintendent for Instruction.

An analysis of student performance on the HSPT indicates that, overall, student test scores continue to improve. As previously mentioned (on page 12), an analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the GEPA indicates that, of the 25 schools (with 8th grade classes), 12 have improved performance from last year, and 8 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the GEPA indicates that,

overall, 12 schools have improved performance from last year and 3 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in math, we believe these figures show progress due to analysis of student performance, staff development and uniform initiatives that are being implemented throughout the district to improve student achievement.

An analysis of student performance on the Language Arts section of the ESPA indicates that, of the 27 schools (with 4th grade classes), 19 have improved performance from last year, and 5 have reached their benchmarks. An analysis of student performance on the Mathematics section of the ESPA indicates that, overall, 14 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. And, on the Science section of the ESPA, 13 schools have improved performance from last year and 5 have reached their benchmarks. Although we have a way to go in all three subject areas, we believe that, as the entire school community participates in the Whole School Reform process, all stakeholders will become familiar with test specifications and the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards. Coupled with the district's emphasis on staff development and effective, uniform initiatives, our children will ultimately reach their full potential.

Staff Accountability (page 44)

- The district's accountability system of rewards and sanctions was submitted to the Commissioner on June 1, 1999, and is included within.
- Review/revise instructional staff appraisal system as needed to provide a comprehensive district-wide performance appraisal system based upon the requirements of each position and the agreed upon job targets. All staff evaluation forms and Professional Improvement Plans were revised in the spring of 1999 and will be implemented in September.
- Establish a database to track instructional and support staff members who demonstrate less than satisfactory performance.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Information regarding the district's accountability system, pursuant to the Abbott Decision, can be found on page 85.

During the 1999-00 school year, revised staff evaluation forms, based upon requirements of each position, were implemented as planned.

All personnel are in a database. Instructional staff are updated daily by the Acting Executive Assistant of Human Resources; non-instructional staff are updated daily by a member of his staff.

SECTION II: COMPLIANCE

ATTAINMENT OF CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
5.1	Pupil Attendance	Compliant	<p>Final attendance numbers for the 1999-00 school year indicate that the district has exceeded the mandate (90 percent) set by the State, and, district wide, we have improved by 3.7 percent from 1998-99. Every school, except for one, is over the required 90 percent. In addition, most of the high schools have exceeded last year's rate by over 7 percentage points. However, the better comparison is between 1997-98 and 1999-00 because the 1998-99 numbers are lower than normal because of the strike. When you view these numbers, you will see a significant improvement in almost every school—especially the high schools.</p> <p><i>See Summary Student Behavior Indicators on page 75.</i></p>
5.2	Dropouts	Compliant	<p>District dropout figures have risen slightly from the 1998-99 school year, but, considering our strong emphasis on attendance this school year, the number of dropouts did not jump significantly. Any dropout is unacceptable, and we will continue to place an emphasis on students staying in school.</p> <p><i>See Summary Student Behavior Indicators on page 78 and District Analysis—fifteen together (Cohorts I and II) on page 100.</i></p>
7.3	Monthly Financial Reports	Compliant	
7.3	Overexpenditure of Funds	Compliant	
7.4	Annual Budget	Compliant	
7.4	Annual Audit and Recommendations	Compliant	
7.5	Transportation Contracts	Compliant	
7.6	Health and Safety Inspection	Compliant	<p><u>Action Plan:</u> All school buildings will be evaluated with the health and safety <u>Checklist Report</u> annually by the maintenance supervisor</p>

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
	Health and Safety Inspection (cont'd.)		<p>responsible for that building. Additionally, the district will use the <u>Jersey City Public Schools School Facility Checklist</u>, an expanded version of the <u>Checklist Report – Evaluation of School Buildings</u> (Indicator 7.6) as an instrument to evaluate school buildings. This checklist will be used during facility audits by a team of central office personnel. The audit findings will be submitted to the school principal and the maintenance supervisor responsible for that building. A corrective action plan will be developed jointly and addressed by school-based personnel, district maintenance personnel and if required, contracted service providers. In order to address the corrective action plan completely, all schools will not undergo this facility audit each year. In the 2000 – 2001 school year, schools will be selected based on the extent of work planned work for that location in the FMP. Persons responsible: Facilities Director, Business Administrator</p> <p><u>Annual Report:</u> Every school building was audited using the health and safety checklist. Every building is compliant in the 80% and 100% categories. Copies of those checklists, signed by the maintenance supervisor and the Superintendent, are on file in the Facilities Office. This year the audit team reviewed and assessed P.S. 20, P.S. 12, and Dickinson High School using the District's expanded checklist. The selection of these schools was random. As stated in the action plan, they should have been selected based on the extent of planned activity in the FMP. The three schools selected had extensive work scheduled. P.S. 20 is scheduled as the next replacement school. The District has identified a site and is awaiting the outcome of the facilities legislation. Dickinson High School is also scheduled for extensive remodeling. P.S. 12, while well maintained, was in need of major renovations in the auditorium. The implementation of the corrective action plans at these locations</p>
	Health and Safety Inspection (cont'd.)		

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
			would not have been a prudent use of resources at this time.
7.7	Comprehensive Maintenance Plan		<p>Action Plan: The plan developed and adopted at the July 1999 Board meeting will be modified to distinguish between facility management plan items and true maintenance items. This plan will be presented to the Board at the September meeting. Items to be performed by professional consultants will be bid in the fall of 2000. Persons responsible: Facilities Director, Acting State Business Administrator</p> <p>Annual Report: This indicator is not fully implemented. District custodial and maintenance personnel addressed parts of the plan in 1999-2000. Engineers contracted by the Treasury addressed health, safety and life cycle issues. The plan must be revised to separate FMP issues and annual maintenance issues.</p>
7.8	<p>Facility Master Plan/Substandard Classrooms</p> <p>Facility Master Plan/Substandard Classrooms (cont'd.)</p>		<p>Action Plan: While the district awaits approval of the FMP and the funding mechanism, we will continue to seek approval of the county office for leased classrooms. The district is aggressively seeking additional sites for acquisition for the implementation of the FMP. Persons responsible: Facilities Director, Business Administrator</p> <p>Annual Report: The District continues to lease classroom space due to overcrowding. Additionally, with the Abbott preschool mandate, the District also leases forty-nine trailers for the preschool program for four-year olds. A copy of all leased space and the purpose for each is available in the Business Administrator's Office.</p> <p>The facilities management plan includes twenty-four new schools. Thirteen of these are Early Childhood Centers. The construction of these new facilities is predicated on projected enrollment and the recommended class sizes in each grade. Without the facilities</p>

#	INDICATOR	STATUS	EXPECTATION
			<p>legislation, the District cannot begin to acquire the needed sites. However, the District has redirected unexpended authorization balances for the acquisition of two early childhood locations. Offer letters have been sent and we are awaiting responses. The District has also contacted the owner of Summit Plaza, where P.S. 42 is housed, expressing the desire to negotiate a sale. Unfortunately, without funding in place, we cannot begin to acquire all of the necessary sites needed to eliminate substandard space.</p> <p>Will not be compliant until all leased spaces are abandoned and the district's Facilities Management Plan has been implemented.</p>

Summary Student Behavior Indicators

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)												
School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)					3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE				1999-00 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00	Difference from Benchmark
	'95-96	'96-97	'97-98	'98-99	'99-00	For: 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96	For: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97	For: 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99			
P.S. #1			88.3	87.7	91.3			N/A	88.0*	89.0	89.1	0.1
P.S. #3	93.2	93.6	93.9	92.2	94.8	92.1	93.1	93.6	93.2	93.6	93.6	0.0
P.S. #5	93.4	94.4	95.0	92.3	95.4	92.8	93.7	94.3	93.9	94.3	94.2	-0.1
P.S. #6	93.5	93.5	94.1	94.0	95.4	93.0	93.4	93.7	93.9	93.9	94.5	0.6
P.S. #8	91.9	92.3	93.0	91.0	94.2	91.0	91.9	92.4	92.1	92.4	92.7	0.3
P.S. #9	90.5	91.4	91.7	89.2	93.2	90.0	90.7	91.2	90.8	91.2	91.4	0.2
P.S. #11	93.6	93.2	93.9	91.3	94.7	92.8	93.3	93.6	92.8	93.6	93.3	-0.3
P.S. #12	89.4	92.0	90.7	89.6	91.6	89.0	90.5	90.7	90.8	90.8	90.6	-0.2
P.S. #14	90.3	92.6	92.0	88.0	91.9	90.0	91.0	91.6	90.9	91.6	90.6	-1.0
P.S. #15	90.3	91.4	92.4	91.0	92.2	88.7	90.6	91.4	91.6	91.6	91.9	0.3
P.S. #16	92.4	93.1	94.3	93.1	95.5	92.1	92.5	93.3	93.5	93.5	94.3	0.8
P.S. #17	93.3	94.0	94.0	92.9	93.9	92.2	93.3	93.8	93.6	93.8	93.6	-0.2
P.S. #20	92.3	93.7	92.4	90.2	94.0	91.6	92.6	92.8	92.1	92.8	92.2	-0.6
P.S. #22	91.1	93.1	91.6	91.2	92.7	90.6	91.3	91.9	92.0	92.0	91.8	-0.2

*A 2-year average, since, at the close of the 1998-99 school year, P.S. #1 had only been in existence for two years.

P.S. #23	92.0	92.0	93.1	91.0	93.1	90.8	91.5	92.4	92.0	92.4	92.4	0.0
----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)

School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)					3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE				1999-00 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00	Difference from Benchmark
	'95-96	'96-97	'97-98	'98-99	'99-00	For: 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96	For: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97	For: 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99			
P.S. #24	91.0	92.4	91.6	89.7	93.5	90.0	91.6	91.7	91.2	91.7	91.6	-0.1
P.S. #25	94.4	94.7	94.9	92.6	95.3	94.0	94.5	94.7	94.1	94.7	94.3	-0.4
P.S. #27	94.0	94.9	94.8	93.1	95.7	93.7	94.3	94.6	94.3	94.6	94.5	-0.1
P.S. #28	93.3	93.5	93.9	91.9	94.6	92.7	93.3	93.6	93.1	93.6	93.5	-0.1
P.S. #29	91.2	92.0	92.3	90.4	93.4	90.5	91.3	91.8	91.6	91.8	92.0	0.2
P.S. #30	91.7	92.7	93.3	90.3	92.3	91.7	92.1	92.6	92.1	92.6	92.0	-0.6
P.S. #31	87.0	87.9	87.2	84.0	90.2	89.0	88.0	87.4	86.4	90.0	87.1	-2.9
P.S. #33	91.6	92.2	94.2	93.7	95.0	92.8	92.3	92.7	93.4	93.4	94.3	0.9
P.S. #34	90.7	92.0	92.6	90.6	93.1	90.6	91.2	91.8	91.7	91.8	92.1	0.3
P.S. #37	91.5	91.8	91.6	91.2	92.7	91.0	91.2	91.6	91.5	91.6	91.8	0.2
P.S. #38	94.2	94.9	94.9	93.6	95.9	93.9	94.4	94.7	94.5	94.7	94.8	0.1
P.S. #39	90.0	91.0	89.7	87.8	91.6	88.9	90.1	90.2	89.5	90.2	89.7	-0.5
P.S. #40	92.2	92.7	91.7	89.4	93.1	91.8	92.4	92.2	91.3	92.4	91.4	-1.0
P.S. #41	91.0	92.1	92.1	90.0	92.9	91.1	91.9	91.7	91.4	91.9	91.7	-0.2
P.S. #42	92.6	94.5	94.0	92.0	95.2	92.5	93.3	93.7	93.5	93.7	93.7	0.0
D.H.S.	81.3	84.0	84.7	83.1	91.0	80.7	81.5	83.3	83.9	87.0	86.3	-0.7
F.H.S.	84.7	89.1	88.9	84.4	92.4	84.3	85.9	87.6	87.5	88.8	88.6	-0.2
L.H.S.	77.3	84.5	83.9	82.7	90.0	77.9	79.5	81.9	83.7	86.9	85.5	-1.4

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)

School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)					3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE				1999-00 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00	Difference from Benchmark
	'95-96	'96-97	'97-98	'98-99	'99-00	For: 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96	For: 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97	For: 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99			
M.A.H.S.	96.3	97.0	96.8	95.9	97.7	95.7	96.2	96.7	96.6	96.7	96.8	0.1
S.H.S.	72.4	81.0	82.4	81.0	88.5	73.6	75.6	78.6	81.5	85.8	84.0	-1.8
Liberty H.S.					93.9					N/A	N/A	N/A
R.D.S.	90.4	90.1	90.9	83.3	92.3	88.7	90.2	90.5	88.1	90.5	88.8	-1.7
Academy I*	85.6	92.3	91.4	89.7	92.9	N/A	N/A	89.8	91.1	91.1	91.3	0.2
Academy II*				82.9	90.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	86.5**	86.6**	0.1
DISTRICT	89.4	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.2	88.9	89.9	90.7	90.7	91.4	91.4	0.0

*Academy I opened during the 1995-96 school year and Academy II opened in September, 1998.

**Both the benchmark and the actual average provided for Academy II are based on 2-year averages, as Academy II has only been in existence for two years.

Summary Student Behavior Indicators

DROPOUT RATE ¹ (16 year olds & over)							
School	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00 Benchmark	1999-00 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #1			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P.S. #3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #6	0.0	40.0	14.3	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #8	2.9	0.0	14.3	40.0	MSS	11.1	-1.1
P.S. #9	20.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #11	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	33.3	-23.3
P.S. #12	38.8	0.0	40.0	0.0	MSS	28.6	-18.6
P.S. #14	14.2	7.7	0.0	14.3	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #15	7.4	36.4	15.4	9.1	MSS	12.5	-2.5
P.S. #16	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #17	12.5	8.7	8.0	5.6	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #20	5.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #22	10.5	0.0	8.3	0.0	MSS	20.0	-10.0
P.S. #23	18.5	20.0	50.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #24	18.7	40.0	10.0	12.5	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #25	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #27	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	20.0	-10.0
P.S. #28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	11.1	-1.1
¹ Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.							

DROPOUT RATE¹ (16 year olds & over)							
School	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00 Benchmark	1999-00 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P.S. #30	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
P.S. #34	14.2	20.0	20.0	25.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #37	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #39	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #40	0.0	50.0	0.0	7.7	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #41	4.8	0.0	14.3	9.1	MSS	0.0	MSS
P.S. #42	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
D.H.S.	12.9	16.5	14.6	14.0	MSS	14.1	-4.1
F.H.S.	5.4	6.3	0.7	1.8	MSS	8.3	MSS
L.H.S.	20.7	23.2	15.8	11.5	MSS	9.6	MSS
M.A.H.S.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
S.H.S.	23.8	17.3	9.2	10.1	MSS	11.2	-1.2
Liberty H.S.					MSS	0.0	MSS
Academy I	N/A	37.5	10.0	21.4	MSS	10.5	-0.5
Academy II				15.0	MSS	0.0	MSS
DISTRICT	13.27	14.6	10.0	9.3	10.0	9.92	MSS
¹ Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.							

**SECTION III:
WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM PROGRESS REPORT**

WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

The district's efforts in implementing Whole School Reform and the key initiatives emerging from the State Supreme Court's decision in *Abbott v. Burke* have been intensive over the last few years. As part of the implementation process, each school is required to submit Whole School Reform implementation plans and school-level budgets to ensure effective and timely implementation of the *Abbott* mandates. Furthermore, district staff are required to submit to the State separate plans outlining their efforts in implementing the Facilities Master Plan, the Early Childhood Programs, and the Required Programs in Secondary Schools. To support these Abbott-driven initiatives, the district has also submitted a central office reorganization plan to support the decentralization inherent in Whole School Reform, as well as an Accountability Plan, outlining awards and sanctions to be used to ensure that Abbott initiatives are implemented effectively for all children.

In order to keep the Strategic Plan a manageable size, the district had to make choices about which of these documents to include in our Strategic Plan. It was decided to include the district's Accountability Plan, since this plan is a driving force behind our implementation of all Abbott initiatives. We have also included a comprehensive update of model selection in the schools (see chart below). The school-level and program-specific plans noted above, and others, are available but have not been duplicated here. Above all, it is our belief that Whole School Reform undergirds the entire plan, and should not be relegated to a "section" of the plan.

	SCHOOL	TYPE*	GRADE LEVEL	COHORT	MODEL	STATUS & BARRIERS
1	P.S. #1	E	K – 3	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
2	P.S. #3	E	Pre-K – 8	Mid-year 2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
3	P.S. #5	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
4	P.S. #6	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
5	P.S. #8	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
6	P.S. #9	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
7	P.S. #11	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
8	P.S. #12	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
9	P.S. #14	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Comer	September 1999 Implementation

	SCHOOL	TYPE*	GRADE LEVEL	COHORT	MODEL	STATUS & BARRIERS
10	P.S. #15	E	Pre-K – 8	Mid-year 2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
11	P.S. #16	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
12	P.S. #17	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 1999 Implementation
13	P.S. #20	E	K – 5	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
14	P.S. #22	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
15	P.S. #23	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
16	P.S. #24	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
17	P.S. #25	E	K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
18	P.S. #27	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 1999 Implementation
19	P.S. #28	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
20	P.S. #29	E	Pre-K – 4	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
21	P.S. #30	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 1999 Implementation
22	P.S. #31	E	Pre-K – 2	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
23	P.S. #33	E	Pre-K – 4	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
24	P.S. #34	E	K – 8	Mid-year 2 nd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
25	P.S. #37	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Alternative School Model	September 2000 Implementation
26	P.S. #38	E	Pre-K – 8	3 rd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
27	P.S. #39	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Comer	September 1999 Implementation
28	P.S. #40	M	6 – 8	Mid-year 2 nd Cohort	Co-NECT	September 2000 Implementation
29	P.S. #41	E	Pre-K – 8	2 nd Cohort	Comer	September 1999 Implementation. Discord among

	SCHOOL	TYPE*	GRADE LEVEL	COHORT	MODEL	STATUS & BARRIERS
						members of the SMT existed during the first year, which hindered implementation of the model. Currently, the district is seeking a new principal for this school.
30	P.S. #42	E	K – 4	3 rd Cohort	Comer	September 2000 Implementation
31	Academy I	E	6 – 8	3 rd Cohort	Coalition of Essential Schools	September 2000 Implementation
32	Academy II	M	7 – 8	Mid-year 2 nd Cohort	America's Choice	September 2000 Implementation
33	Dickinson	S	9 – 12	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001
34	Ferris	S	9 – 12	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001
35	Liberty	S	9	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001
36	Lincoln	S	9 – 12	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001
37	McNair Academic	S	9 – 12	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001
38	Snyder	S	9 – 12	3 rd Cohort	TBD	January 30, 2001

For further discussion on Whole School Reform, see page 23.

DISTRICT-WIDE WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS & ISSUES

Although change is always difficult and can be slow, a tremendous effort was expended by central office and school personnel to meet the requirements and deadlines of the Abbott Decision. In Jersey City, some schools that originally expected to become part of Cohort II did not achieve majority votes for WSR models in 1998-99 and, therefore, began exploration again during the 1999-00 school year. All schools, in the spirit of WSR, engaged all staff members and SMTs in the model exploration and selection process. The majority of the elementary/middle schools became part of Cohort III, and when reluctant Cohort III schools realized the benefits being reaped by schools that entered Cohort II, change came more easily. Central office staff provided assistance if instances arose when a majority vote was not forthcoming, and by the spring of 2000, all elementary and middle schools met the deadline for selection of WSR models. One school, Rafael de J. Cordero School #37, submitted an alternative model application that was approved by the Department of Education.

The district and the State are working together to improve distribution of Whole School Reform materials.

Disparity in expectations between district-level supervisors and Co-NECT Model requirements existed in terms of pacing of the district's curriculum. The three Cohort II Co-NECT schools raised this issue and Co-NECT training was provided for district-level staff. The district agreed to provide additional training for its central office personnel and supervisors on Whole School Reform models that were adopted in Jersey City. At this writing, Co-NECT training is underway for district supervisors.

Regarding Required Programs in the Secondary Schools and Whole School Reform applications at the elementary level, a failure to keep central office staff informed during all phases of the review process at the State level hindered the development of budget to support approved positions for the 2000-01 school year.

Finally, because the deadline for selection of Whole School Reform models at the high school level has changed numerous times over the past two years, it may be difficult to make wise selections by January 30, 2001. Secondary schools anticipated an additional year of exploration. On June 9, 2000, high school principals met with central office staff to express their concerns. SMT members of all high schools began meeting in September to coordinate exploration efforts to date, relate individual school progress toward model selection and (because of the high mobility rate in the city) investigate whether a common model might be feasible at the high school level.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE DISTRICT-WIDE ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

Last year, a district committee designed the Jersey City Public Schools' Accountability Plan to encourage all stakeholders to work collaboratively to improve student achievement. During the 1999-00 school year, the Plan was used by School Management Teams to guide the development of school-level plans. In addition to setting goals for implementation of the selected WSR models and the training that is necessary to faithfully replicate the model and prepare the SMTs for their newfound responsibilities, Cohort II schools have set goals aligned with the CCCS and the improvement of skills to bring about those goals. The following are some of the projects that Cohort II schools will be embarking upon to bring about greater school achievement.

- Studies of students' current progress, research into recommended school-wide strategies for success and action plans to address noted needs as implementation of the Whole School Reform models unfolds.
- Study groups to research use of time, common planning allotments and recommend changes in the school schedule.
- Research into needs of special populations.
- Development of a three-year plan to improve student achievement and provide outreach to parents and the community regarding models and school goals.
- Curriculum mapping to assure alignment with the NJCCCS and State assessments.
- Ascertain technology expertise within the school and determine how technology is being used to help students master the NJCCCS in the various content areas.
- Survey professional practice to foster reflection on the use of school wide practices and how they influence educational quality and the ability of students to achieve high standards as measured by local and State assessments.
- Study discipline and student safety with recommended changes in school practices and use of support systems to remove obstacles to learning.
- Ongoing review of progress to improve student academic achievement, behavior, attendance, self-concept and school climate.
- Expanding learning experiences for students while fostering self-esteem.
- Peer assistance.
- Student support teams.
- Correlating knowledge of child development, adult development, mental health principles, organizational development and relationship theory to school management.
- On-going collection and utilization of data to make decisions.
- Systematic training that assists staff and parents to gain necessary skills and strategies which promote personal,

- social and academic growth among students and adults.
- Development of parent teams.

RECOGNITION/REWARDS

The initiatives in this section of the Accountability Plan have been accomplished when it was within our power to do so. Those initiatives that required comparison of data from the 1998-99 school year (baseline) to the current school year are in progress and will be addressed during the 2000-01 school year.

In progress:

- An audit of the attainment of benchmarks was conducted. The schools that have met their goals will be given a cash award (as outlined in the Accountability Plan) to use on a project of choice of the SMT.
- Schools that post greatest gains or maintain excellent performance will be honored at a Board meeting at the beginning of the 2000-01 school year and receive a banner to publicize their success in their communities. Additionally, representatives of parent organizations will be recognized and invited to a special dinner or breakfast.
- Discussion with local colleges continues and plans for rewards for those students who pass all sections of the GEPA are being explored. In 1999, 742 students scored at the proficient or advanced proficient levels on both sections. In 2000, 596 students scored at the proficient or advanced proficient levels on all three sections. The district is in the process of finalizing a plan for further rewarding students who achieve these levels.

Completed:

- Parents have been recognized in various district publications including Liberty Lines and The Communicator.
- Principals have acknowledged and honored parents at the school level for their contributions throughout the school year. Some of the rewards include: Recognition of active members of parent organizations and other volunteers during various assemblies and community service ceremonies throughout the school year and during graduation and exit day ceremonies. Parent volunteers were presented with flowers, plaques, certificates, bookmarks and/or pins and thanked publicly for their service.
- Through parent grants, parent representatives who applied for funds (up to \$5,000) on the school's behalf, received

them to implement projects of their choice aimed toward improving student achievement. Projects made parents at ease in school environments, upgraded their skills and introduced strategies for assisting and encouraging their children. Parents who received these grants were acknowledged at the January 2000 Board of Education Meeting. Some grants rewarded parents who attended all parent council meetings with trips, dinners and attendance at other local events accompanied by their children. In some schools, prior to distribution of report cards at Open House nights or at awards breakfasts, parents of students who attained academic awards were presented with a token of appreciation for their support and encouragement. Parent Appreciation Days provided guest speakers, certificates of appreciation and breakfast, lunch and other rewards to parents.

- Staff members who achieved 100% attendance received a stipend of \$350 per semester.

SANCTIONS

Supervisors are ever present in the schools to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented and paced appropriately. District sanctions stress support of instructional staff so that they may reach high goals in spite of societal factors that influence some children's inability to achieve at the required levels of performance. With the advent of WSR, school staffs are assessing current performance, programs and goals, are researching the most effective strategies to improve student performance and are making adjustments accordingly. Professional Development Schools (P.S. Nos. 5, 20, 30, 34 and 42)—in collaboration with Fairleigh Dickinson University—were expanded through an enhancement grant to include P.S. Nos. 17 and 27 whereby needs of the instructional staff were addressed through peer assistance. Many professional days were requested and honored during the 1999-00 school year to upgrade teachers' skills in light of WSR model expectations.

In addition, during the last school year, collaboration between New Jersey City University and the Jersey City Public Schools has resulted in an additional five (5) Professional Development Schools. The purpose of this endeavor is to train effective cooperating teachers in an effort to produce the best future teachers (hopefully for the Jersey City Public Schools). The initial seminar was conducted on May 22 for selected staff members from P.S. Nos. 15, 23, 37, 39 and Dickinson High School.

The format of the Teacher Academy has been changed from lecture based to a problem-based learning experience. Attendees develop projects, which are then presented to other teams, and a panel of supervisors. This initiative was the recipient of the Best Practice Award during the 1999-00 school year.

A video library has been assembled consisting of ninety-four (94) titles covering such topics as assessment, brain research, classroom environment, effective schools, emotional intelligence, learning styles, multiple intelligences, technology and Whole School Reform to name a few. Information has been disseminated to schools and an order form has been designed. During the last school year, eight (8) principals have requested fourteen (14) tapes to address needs of their staffs.

During the 1999-2000 school year, the District continued its demand for performance and attendance accountability among teaching staff members. Eighty-eight (88) teaching staff members had increments withheld during the 1999-2000 school year due to poor performance/or poor attendance.

This year four (4) teachers were served with tenure charges based upon their long history of poor performance in the classroom. Every teacher who was served had at least one prior increment withholding based upon poor performance. Moreover, performance evaluation indicated that these teachers demonstrated little or no improvement in the classroom despite these prior warnings. One teacher has since retired/resigned. In conformance with law, the remaining three (3) teachers have been given ninety (90) day assistance plans to correct their deficiencies. If, upon completion of the ninety (90) days, the deficiencies have not been corrected, the charges will then be certified to the Commissioner of Education. The District also certified tenure charges to the Commissioner against two (2) teachers, based upon their history of chronic and excessive absenteeism during their employment with the Jersey City Public Schools. Both teachers had at least one prior increment withholding based upon poor attendance, yet demonstrated little or no improvement in their rate of absenteeism despite these prior warnings. Both teachers have since retired/resigned.

Additionally, this year the District established a comprehensive attendance accountability system pursuant to which all administrators are required to closely monitor, on a monthly basis, the attendance of each and every employee under their supervision.

APPENDIX A

Summary Student Performance Indicators

DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL

11 th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Actual Difference	1999-00 Benchmark	Difference From Benchmark
Reading (%)	71.7	71.2	81.5	74.6	82.5	7.9	81.5	1.0
Math (%)	83.0	85.3	84.2	93.2	93.7	0.5	93.2	0.5
Writing (%)	84.9	82.4	83.6	89.5	90.4	0.9	89.5	0.9

 = Met State Standard

FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL

11 th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Actual Difference	1999-00 Benchmark	Difference From Benchmark
Reading (%)	62.8	60.5	70.6	55.6	60.9	5.3	70.6	-9.7
Math (%)	70.3	67.1	64.5	72.9	73.3	0.4	79.0	-5.7
Writing (%)	77.6	67.8	74.2	78.6	77.0	-1.6	81.8	-4.8

= Met State Standard

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

11 th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Actual Difference	1999-00 Benchmark	Difference From Benchmark
Reading (%)	63.4	60.0	68.4	67.3	72.5	5.2	76.2	-3.7
Math (%)	61.6	65.8	58.7	67.5	72.0	4.5	76.3	-4.3
Writing (%)	75.0	76.1	72.5	88.8	82.4	-6.4	88.8	-6.4

= Met State Standard

MC NAIR ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL

11 th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Actual Difference	1999-00 Benchmark	Difference From Benchmark
Reading (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Math (%)	100.0	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Writing (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

= Met State Standard

SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL

11th Grade HSPT	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	Actual Difference	1999-00 Benchmark	Difference From Benchmark
Reading (%)	50.8	47.8	59.8	55.6	43.0	-12.6	70.3	-27.3
Math (%)	43.7	53.8	43.1	51.5	58.0	6.5	68.3	-10.3
Writing (%)	63.4	61.9	67.8	71.3	74.6	3.3	78.2	-3.6

= Met State Standard

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)
Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	Actual 1998-99*	Actual 1999-00*	Actual Difference	Benchmark 1999-00	Diff. from Benchmark
P.S. # 3	91.9	89.3	-2.6	91.9	-2.6
P.S. # 5	89.6	90.9	1.3	89.6	1.3
P.S. # 6	93.7	89.4	-4.3	93.7	-4.3
P.S. # 8	85.2	80.5	-4.7	85.2	-4.7
P.S. # 9	69.4	70.4	1.0	77.2	-6.8
P.S. # 11	82.5	73.3	-9.2	83.8	-10.5
P.S. # 12	59.1	60.0	0.9	72.1	-12.1
P.S. # 14	61.4	56.0	-5.4	73.2	-17.2
P.S. # 15	54.8	36.7	-18.1	69.8	-33.1
P.S. # 16	88.9	92.0	3.1	88.9	3.1
P.S. # 17	79.0	78.6	-0.4	82.0	-3.4
P.S. # 22	63.2	61.3	-1.9	74.1	-12.8
P.S. # 23	85.3	89.6	4.3	85.3	4.3
P.S. # 24	75.3	91.0	15.7	80.2	10.8
P.S. # 25	94.7	96.6	1.9	94.7	1.9
P.S. # 27	98.8	92.4	-6.4	98.8	-6.4
P.S. # 28	88.3	88.7	0.4	88.3	0.4
P.S. # 34	62.7	61.8	-0.9	73.9	-12.1
P.S. # 37	82.9	93.2	10.3	84.0	9.2
P.S. # 38	86.7	86.0	-0.7	86.7	-0.7
P.S. # 39	56.1	74.2	18.1	70.6	3.6
P.S. # 40	84.1	76.6	-7.5	84.6	-8.0
P.S. # 41	36.9	46.1	9.2	56.9	-10.8
Academy I	67.0	57.7	-9.3	76.0	-18.3
Academy II	22.6	27.9	5.3	42.6	-14.7
DISTRICT	76.0	74.5	-1.5	80.5	-6.0

*Figures as reported on School & District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 8/19/99 and 8/14/00).

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Mathematics

SCHOOL	Actual 1998-99*	Actual 1999-00*	Actual Difference	Benchmark 1999-00	Diff. from Benchmark
P.S. # 3	37.8	53.6	15.8	57.8	-4.2
P.S. # 5	72.4	84.8	12.4	78.7	6.1
P.S. # 6	65.3	61.8	-3.5	75.2	-13.4
P.S. # 8	67.9	54.8	-13.1	76.5	-21.7
P.S. # 9	34.3	48.1	13.8	54.3	-6.2
P.S. # 11	67.5	71.1	3.6	76.3	-5.2
P.S. # 12	17.8	14.3	-3.5	48.0	-33.7
P.S. # 14	30.2	29.2	-1.0	50.2	-21.0
P.S. # 15	16.7	13.4	-3.3	48.0	-34.6
P.S. # 16	59.2	56.0	-3.2	72.1	-16.1
P.S. # 17	50.6	55.4	4.8	65.6	-10.2
P.S. # 22	22.9	22.6	-0.3	48.0	-25.4
P.S. # 23	76.8	73.1	-3.7	80.9	-7.8
P.S. # 24	52.4	55.0	2.6	67.4	-12.4
P.S. # 25	64.2	78.0	13.8	74.6	3.4
P.S. # 27	74.0	82.3	8.3	79.5	2.8
P.S. # 28	54.4	52.2	-2.2	69.4	-17.2
P.S. # 34	35.3	30.9	-4.4	55.3	-24.4
P.S. # 37	31.7	40.7	9.0	51.7	-11.0
P.S. # 38	56.6	56.0	-0.6	70.8	-14.8
P.S. # 39	29.3	43.8	14.5	49.3	-5.5
P.S. # 40	42.1	51.2	9.1	57.1	-5.9
P.S. # 41	5.9	6.6	0.7	48.0	-41.4
Academy I	61.0	50.9	-10.1	73.0	-22.1
Academy II	7.3	6.9	-0.4	48.0	-41.1
DISTRICT	48.0	48.4	0.4	63.0	-14.6

*Figures as reported on School & District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 8/19/99 and 8/14/00).

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Science

SCHOOL	Actual 1999-00*
P.S. # 3	57.2
P.S. # 5	63.6
P.S. # 6	67.1
P.S. # 8	54.8
P.S. # 9	25.9
P.S. # 11	68.8
P.S. # 12	25.7
P.S. # 14	43.8
P.S. # 15	16.9
P.S. # 16	56.0
P.S. # 17	43.4
P.S. # 22	14.5
P.S. # 23	70.2
P.S. # 24	58.0
P.S. # 25	80.4
P.S. # 27	74.7
P.S. # 28	50.7
P.S. # 34	23.6
P.S. # 37	49.2
P.S. # 38	67.8
P.S. # 39	34.4
P.S. # 40	41.6
P.S. # 41	19.7
Academy I	57.7
Academy II	13.7
DISTRICT	48.2

*Figures as reported in the NJDOE's "GEPA SCORE REPORTS" published on 8/14/00.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)
Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	Actual 1998-99*	Actual 1999-00*	Actual Difference	Benchmark 1999-00	Diff. from Benchmark
P.S. # 3	55.8	43.6	-12.2	70.4	-26.8
P.S. # 5	35.7	50.0	14.3	55.7	-5.7
P.S. # 6	46.7	43.1	-3.6	61.7	-18.6
P.S. # 8	29.9	31.3	1.4	49.9	-18.6
P.S. # 9	21.4	53.3	31.9	41.4	11.9
P.S. # 11	40.8	40.3	-0.5	55.8	-15.5
P.S. # 12	31.1	24.4	-6.7	51.1	-26.7
P.S. # 14	9.2	22.2	13.0	29.2	-7.0
P.S. # 15	12.1	12.5	0.4	32.1	-19.6
P.S. # 16	18.5	48.5	30.0	38.5	10.0
P.S. # 17	13.1	32.5	19.4	33.1	-0.6
P.S. # 20	14.6	36.2	21.6	34.6	1.6
P.S. # 22	14.9	23.9	9.0	34.9	-11.0
P.S. # 23	15.1	30.8	15.7	35.1	-4.3
P.S. # 24	25.7	36.0	10.3	45.7	-9.7
P.S. # 25	23.9	39.5	15.6	43.9	-4.4
P.S. # 27	25.4	41.5	16.1	45.4	-3.9
P.S. # 28	38.5	45.7	7.2	58.5	-12.8
P.S. # 29	23.4	10.9	-12.5	43.4	-32.5
P.S. # 30	14.5	18.2	3.7	34.5	-16.3
P.S. # 33	42.6	77.3	34.7	57.6	19.7
P.S. # 34	17.7	24.6	6.9	37.7	-13.1
P.S. # 37	50.8	61.0	10.2	65.8	-4.8
P.S. # 38	33.7	28.3	-5.4	53.7	-25.4
P.S. # 39	12.1	6.7	-5.4	32.1	-25.4
P.S. # 41	21.9	19.1	-2.8	41.9	-22.8
P.S. # 42	41.9	65.6	23.7	56.9	8.7
DISTRICT	25.4	34.4	9.0	45.4	-11.0
*Figures as reported on School & District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 9/14/99 and 9/26/00)					

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)
Mathematics

SCHOOL	Actual 1998-99*	Actual 1999-00*	Actual Difference	Benchmark 1999-00	Diff. from Benchmark
P.S. # 3	81.4	48.7	-32.7	83.2	-34.5
P.S. # 5	64.3	50.0	-14.3	74.7	-24.7
P.S. # 6	67.8	47.1	-20.7	76.4	-29.3
P.S. # 8	62.6	58.8	-3.8	73.8	-15.0
P.S. # 9	39.2	62.2	23.0	59.2	3.0
P.S. # 11	69.3	65.0	-4.3	77.2	-12.2
P.S. # 12	24.4	31.0	6.6	44.4	-13.4
P.S. # 14	20.6	37.5	16.9	41.5	-4.0
P.S. # 15	17.3	19.5	2.2	41.5	-22.0
P.S. # 16	66.7	66.7	0.0	75.9	-9.2
P.S. # 17	28.7	26.1	-2.6	48.7	-22.6
P.S. # 20	17.2	30.8	13.6	41.5	-10.7
P.S. # 22	29.7	26.8	-2.9	49.7	-22.9
P.S. # 23	31.3	54.2	22.9	51.3	2.9
P.S. # 24	27.0	50.6	23.6	47.0	3.6
P.S. # 25	40.1	56.8	16.7	55.1	1.7
P.S. # 27	45.0	47.5	2.5	60.0	-12.5
P.S. # 28	46.7	61.0	14.3	61.7	-0.7
P.S. # 29	39.6	21.8	-17.8	59.6	-37.8
P.S. # 30	48.0	34.4	-13.6	63.0	-28.6
P.S. # 33	72.1	81.8	9.7	78.6	3.2
P.S. # 34	9.3	23.6	14.3	41.5	-17.9
P.S. # 37	95.4	78.0	-17.4	95.4	-17.4
P.S. # 38	54.4	43.4	-11.0	69.4	-26.0
P.S. # 39	11.7	20.3	8.6	41.5	-21.2
P.S. # 41	38.1	27.8	-10.3	58.1	-30.3
P.S. # 42	45.1	56.3	11.2	60.1	-3.8
DISTRICT	41.5	45.0	3.5	56.5	-11.5

*Figures as reported on School & District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 9/14/99 and 9/26/00).

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Science

SCHOOL	Actual 1998-99*	Actual 1999-00*	Actual Difference	Benchmark 1999-00	Diff. from Benchmark
P.S. # 3	83.7	82.0	-1.7	84.4	-2.4
P.S. # 5	83.4	80.9	-2.5	84.2	-3.3
P.S. # 6	83.3	81.4	-1.9	84.2	-2.8
P.S. # 8	74.7	76.5	1.8	79.9	-3.4
P.S. # 9	54.5	80.0	25.5	69.5	10.5
P.S. # 11	84.2	83.1	-1.1	84.6	-1.5
P.S. # 12	53.4	72.1	18.7	68.4	3.7
P.S. # 14	42.6	54.0	11.4	57.6	-3.6
P.S. # 15	40.3	44.7	4.4	55.3	-10.6
P.S. # 16	92.6	87.9	-4.7	92.6	-4.7
P.S. # 17	62.6	60.4	-2.2	73.8	-13.4
P.S. # 20	61.0	65.7	4.7	73.0	-7.3
P.S. # 22	43.8	49.3	5.5	58.8	-9.5
P.S. # 23	60.5	75.0	14.5	72.8	2.2
P.S. # 24	60.0	72.0	12.0	72.5	-0.5
P.S. # 25	75.4	79.2	3.8	80.2	-1.0
P.S. # 27	72.4	68.7	-3.7	78.7	-10.0
P.S. # 28	83.5	84.9	1.4	84.3	0.6
P.S. # 29	51.0	43.5	-7.5	66.0	-22.5
P.S. # 30	68.4	65.9	-2.5	76.7	-10.8
P.S. # 33	91.2	93.9	2.7	91.2	2.7
P.S. # 34	41.9	49.2	7.3	56.9	-7.7
P.S. # 37	95.4	88.1	-7.3	95.4	-7.3
P.S. # 38	85.4	69.6	-15.8	85.4	-15.8
P.S. # 39	47.5	38.3	-9.2	62.5	-24.2
P.S. # 41	52.4	45.5	-6.9	67.4	-21.9
P.S. # 42	74.2	71.9	-2.3	79.6	-7.7
DISTRICT	65.8	68.7	2.9	75.4	-6.7

*Figures as reported on School & District Summary Statistics (Reports Printed 9/14/99 and 9/26/00).

APPENDIX B

DISTRICT ANALYSIS—COHORT I *fifteen together*

<i>fifteen together</i> ® students	8/98	1/99	4/99	6/99	8/99	9/99	6/00	%
Students	333	333	333	333	333	333	333	
Participating	330	270	226	220	170	242	213	63.9
Returned to grammar school	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	1.2
Off Roll (dropped out of school)	0	11	15	15	15	15	25	7.5
Transferred out of district	3	24	28	28	28	28	37	11.1
Not actively participating (on roll)	0	24	60	66	116	44	54	16.2

In June 1998, 333 students began the “*fifteen together*” program. 213 (63.9%) of these students participated and completed the full 2 year program.

SCHOOLS	SNYDER							FERRIS						
Students:	8/98	1/99	4/99	6/99	8/99	9/99	6/00	8/98	1/99	4/99	6/99	8/99	9/99	6/00
Participating	63	50	46	46	40	53	39	68	59	45	45	28	42	38
Returned (grammar school)		1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1
Off Roll (dropped out)	-	2	2	2	2	2	9	-	2	2	2	2	2	2
Transferred (out of district)	-	4	4	4	4	4	6	-	6	6	6	6	6	7
Not actively participating (on roll)	-	6	10	10	16	3	8	-	4	18	18	35	21	24
Totals	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	68	72	72	72	72	72	72

SCHOOLS	DICKINSON							LINCOLN						
Students:	8/98	1/99	4/99	6/99	8/99	9/99	6/00	8/98	1/99	4/99	6/99	8/99	9/99	6/00
Participating	115	97	83	77	60	86	86	84	64	53	53	41	61	50
Returned (grammar school)		1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Off Roll (dropped out)		4	4	4	4	4	8		3	2	2	2	2	6
Transferred (out of district)	3	10	15	15	15	15	10		4	3	3	3	3	5
Not actively participating (on roll)		4	12	18	35	9	10		10	24	24	36	16	21
Totals	118	116	115	115	115	115	115	84	82	83	85	83	83	83

DISTRICT ANALYSIS—COHORT II

fifteen together

<i>“fifteen together”</i> students	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00	%
Students	331	331	331	331	
Participating	331	237	278	268	80.9
Returned to grammar school	0	7	10	10	3.2
Off Roll (dropped out of school)	0	0	0	10	3
Transferred to Liberty H.S.	0	17	17	17	
Transferred out of District	0	15	22	19	5.7
Not actively participating (on roll)	0	64	8	24	7.2

Cohort II began in July 1999 with 331 students. As of 6/00, there were **268 (80.9%)** students actively participating in the program.

SCHOOLS	DICKINSON				LINCOLN				SNYDER				FERRIS				LIBERTY			
	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00	8/99	9/99	11/99	6/00
Students Participating	110	85	93	93	83	56	63	63	73	40	65	53	65	56	57	46	0	17	13	13
Students returned to grammar school	0	0	2	2	0	3	4	4	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Off Roll (dropped out of school)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
Transferred out of district	0	4	9	6	0	3	5	3	0	6	6	6	0	2	2	4	0	0	2	2
Transferred to Liberty School	0	8	8	8	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0
Not actively participating (on roll)	0	16	0	4	0	20	8**	10	0	25	0	6	0	3	0	2	0	0	2	2
Totals	110	110	110	110	83	83	83	83	73	73	73	73	65	65	65	65	0	17	17	17

**Numbers change from September to November because of “active campaign” by counselor/mentors to recruit “not actively” participating students back into the program.